

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator if all the committee amendments have been disposed of?

Mr. BORAH. Those are all the amendments that I desire to have considered at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to have a little bill passed.

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment I will yield. I ask to have the bill reprinted with the committee amendments included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. BORAH. I now ask that the bill be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered.

JOSEPH HODGES.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 7754) for the relief of Joseph Hodges.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to add to the end of the bill the following proviso: "Provided, That upon the reconveyance of the surrendered lands they will become a part of the Cache National Forest," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue a patent to Joseph Hodges for the following-described lands: The southwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the south half of the northwest quarter of section 29; the south half of the northeast quarter and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 30; the west half of the southeast quarter and the west half of the northeast quarter of section 15; the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 10, all in township 13 north, range 5 east, of Salt Lake meridian, upon the transfer by the said Joseph Hodges to the United States of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 3; the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 20; the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 27; the south half of section 16, all in township 14 north, range 4 east, of Salt Lake meridian, situate in the Cache National Forest: *Provided,* That upon the reconveyance of the surrendered lands they will become a part of the Cache National Forest.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 28499) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House accepts the invitation of the Senate extended to the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives to attend the exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public services of the late JAMES S. SHEERMAN, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, to be held in the Senate Chamber on Saturday, the 15th day of February next, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 28499. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 8, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 7, 1913.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for this new day with all its hopes and promises. Thou hast created us for action and inspired us with high ideals. Illumine our minds and quicken within us the highest and best impulses, that we may add as individuals to our parts and strive to better the conditions of our fellow men; to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INDICTMENTS, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 808) which is on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 808.

Resolved, That the Attorney General of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the House of Representatives at the earliest practical date all letters, briefs of evidence, documents, and written opinions on file in the Department of Justice relating to or having any connection with the indictment returned in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas against C. N. Payne, John D. Archbold, Henry C. Folger, W. C. Teagle, A. C. Eble, E. R. Brown, John Sealy, Standard Oil Co. of New York, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and Magnolia Petroleum Co. of Texas, charging them with conspiring to restrain interstate trade and commerce of the Pierce-Fordyce Oil Association in violation of the criminal provisions of the Sherman Act, or relating in any way to the order of the Attorney General of the United States directing the United States marshal for the southern district of New York not to execute bench warrants for the arrest of John D. Archbold, W. C. Teagle, and H. C. Folger, jr., issued on said indictment.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, there are some committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "requested" and insert "directed, if not incompatible with the public interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARNER. There are one or two other amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Folger," insert the word "junior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the capital letter "H" and insert the word "Henry."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman about the substitution of the word "request" for the word "direct." Is this the case where a Federal judge in Texas issued subpoenas for certain Standard Oil people in New York City and the Department of Justice refused to serve the warrants?

Mr. GARNER. It is. It was not a subpoena. It was a capias.

Mr. MURDOCK. Issued by the judge?

Mr. GARNER. Issued by the court on a grand jury indictment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has any explanation ever been made by the Department of Justice why they did not serve these papers?

Mr. GARNER. The Department of Justice—

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman—

Mr. GARNER. I would like an opportunity to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will get at it in this way: The resolution as introduced into this House directed the Attorney General to explain to the House why these warrants were not served.

Mr. GARNER. When was that?

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand it, that was it.

Mr. GARNER. No; this resolution—

Mr. MURDOCK. It must have been introduced, because the committee now brings in a resolution with an amendment changing the word "directed" to the word "requested."

Mr. GARNER. No; it is just the reverse of that, changing the word "requested" to "directed."

Mr. MURDOCK. So the resolution as it now stands is more mandatory than the original resolution?

Mr. GARNER. It certainly is.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad of that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on Senate bill 7160, an act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1448).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 7160, an act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to rec-

ommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2, 5, and 8.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9, and agree to the same.

JOE J. RUSSELL,
J. A. M. ADAIR,
CHAS. E. FULLER,
Managers on the part of the House.
P. J. McCUMBER,
HENRY E. BURNHAM,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT.

Amendment No. 1, the case of Susannah Roberts (S. 449): In this case the widow is not badly disabled and hence the item was stricken from the bill, and the Senate recedes from its disagreement.

Amendment No. 2, the case of Lamond Partridge (S. 2978): This case was stricken from the bill on the ground that soldier's condition did not warrant further relief. Further investigation shows him to be helpless, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 3, Gustav A. Kindblade (S. 3786): In this case the House reduced the rate from \$50 to \$40 on the ground that soldier was not totally helpless, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 4, the case of Martin Parker (S. 4063): In this case the item was stricken from the bill on the ground that the evidence did not warrant further increase, and the Senate recedes from its disagreement.

Amendment No. 5, the case of Benjamin F. Adams (S. 4072): This item was stricken from the bill by the House, but on further investigation it is believed the increase is warranted, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 6, the case of Mary Byrne (S. 4187): In this case the amount allowed was reduced by the House from \$30 to \$20, and the Senate recedes from its disagreement.

Amendment No. 7, the case of Alice O. Lord (S. 5509): In this case the widow did not marry until 1895, and hence the House struck the item from the bill. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 8, the case of Julius T. Morse (S. 5590): In this case the House reduced the amount from \$40 to \$36, but on further investigation it is found that \$40 has been allowed in similar cases, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 9, the case of James V. D. Ten Eyck (S. 6660): In this case the House reduced the rate from \$40 to \$36 to accord to amounts allowed in similar cases, and the Senate recedes from its disagreement.

JOE J. RUSSELL,
J. A. M. ADAIR,
CHAS. E. FULLER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on Senate bill 8034, an act granting pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report. The Clerk read as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1449).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 8034, an act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 3, 4, and 8, and agree to the same.

JOE J. RUSSELL,
J. A. M. ADAIR,
CHAS. E. FULLER,
Managers on the part of the House.
P. J. McCUMBER,
HENRY E. BURNHAM,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT.

Amendment No. 1 is the case of Thomas W. Dickey (S. 300): The man was never regularly mustered into the service of the Government, and hence the item was stricken from the bill; and the Senate recedes from its disagreement.

Amendment No. 2, the case of Addie Roof (S. 2379): In this case the widow married the soldier in 1892, a short time after the passage of the 1890 law, and was stricken from the bill on those grounds. The House recedes from this amendment, as a number of similar cases have since been passed.

Amendment No. 3, the case of Andrew King (S. 5657): In this case the Senate allowed a rate of \$30; the House reduced the amount to \$24; and the Senate recedes from its disagreement.

Amendment No. 4, the case of James Luther Justice (S. 6968): In this case the Senate allowed \$30, and the House \$24. The Senate recedes from its disagreement.

Amendment No. 5, the case of Martha J. Stephenson (S. 7025): The Senate allowed this at \$30, and the House reduced it to \$20. On reviewing, it is believed that the \$30 is just; and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 6, the case of Mate Fulkerson (S. 7084): The House struck this item from the bill on the grounds that widow did not marry until after 1890, but recedes from the amendment for the reason that since other bills of like character have been passed.

Amendment No. 7, Lydia M. Jacobs (S. 7173): This was stricken from the bill on account of date of marriage, but the House recedes for the same reasons as the preceding case.

Amendment No. 8: Strikes out the case of John Cook (S. 7214), who has died since the bill passed the Senate; and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 9, Sarah McLaury (S. 7363): This is another case where the widow married shortly after 1890; and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 10, Delphine R. Burritt (S. 7805): In this case the House reduced the amount from \$40 to \$30, but further evidence shows total helplessness physically and mentally; and the House recedes.

JOE J. RUSSELL,
J. A. M. ADAIR,
CHAS. E. FULLER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

BILLS ON THE PRIVATE CALENDAR.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following order, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House order 76.

Ordered, That on next Monday, February 10, the House shall stand in recess from the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., until the hour of 8 o'clock p. m., at which time it shall be in order to consider, only in the House as in Committee of the Whole, bills on the Private Calendar which are not objected to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the order.

The question was taken, and the order was agreed to.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 28283) making appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agriculture appropriation bill, with Mr. BEALL of Texas in the chair.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, upon confirmation of reports that the hull of the frigate *Philadelphia* has been located under water in the harbor of Tripoli, I introduced a bill, which has the approval of the Department of the Navy,

for a small appropriation for a survey to recover the hull or such portions thereof, including guns and other equipment, as may seem to the Secretary of the Navy desirable. The Government has recently spent large sums in recovering and disposing of the wreck of the *Maine* in Havana Harbor and has just completed the appropriate service of transporting the remains of the illustrious John Paul Jones to their last resting place at Annapolis, so that if authority is given in this instance to recover such relics of the *Philadelphia* as may be worthy of preservation, it will be in line with precedent and will tend to rekindle in the United States a spirit of patriotism of most wholesome import.

The age in which we live is one of commercialism, when it is difficult for the Department of the Navy to secure recruits for that service upon the high seas, which in times of war is so essential. With a declining merchant marine on the one hand and the rearing of great battleships on the other, it is refreshing to recall the incidents leading up to the American invasion of the Mediterranean Sea and the suppression of piracy along the Barbary coast.

So intimately connected with this earlier history was the frigate *Philadelphia* that a discussion of the bill making an appropriation for her recovery not only invites comparison of our maritime prowess and enterprise of more than a century ago, but readily reveals one of the most interesting chapters in our naval annals. It is both helpful and inspiring.

DONATED BY THE MERCHANTS.

Built 114 years ago, the vessel was commonly regarded as one of the hugest warships afloat. A description of her, taken from memoranda in the Navy Department, shows her to have been a frigate of 1,240 tons, with 36 guns—elsewhere reported as 44—and 307 men. She appears to have been not more than 200 feet long—about one-third the length of a modern battleship—and of 40 feet beam. She was built at Philadelphia in 1799 by subscriptions of the merchants of that city, and cost \$179,349. All the details of design and construction are not available, but one of those who superintended her building in the summer of 1799 was Capt. Thomas Robinson, appointed captain in the Navy September 24, 1799, and who served until discharged by the Peace Establishment act, September 26, 1801. The frigate was launched Thursday, November 28, 1799, as shown by the following announcement taken from the *Philadelphia Gazette* and *Universal Daily Advertiser* of Friday, November 29, 1799:

"THE LAUNCH.

"Frigate 'City of Philadelphia.'

"At half past 2 o'clock yesterday afternoon this elegant ship was safely launched into the Delaware, accompanied by the acclamations of thousands of spectators who lined the shore. As soon as she was afloat salutes were fired from the *Augusta* and *Richmond*, armed brigs laying at anchor in the cove.

"The tide serving at an earlier hour than was expected, owing to a strong wind from the southeast, the launch took place sooner than was intended, by which a great number of people who promised themselves the pleasure of viewing this beautiful operation were disappointed, but who were, however, much gratified by afterwards seeing one of the finest ships ever built in this country safely moored.

"The *City of Philadelphia* is an evidence of the patriotism of the merchants of the city after which she is named, being built by their subscriptions; will carry 44 heavy guns and be commanded by Capt. Decatur, formerly of the *Delaware*, sloop of war."

FRIGATE MADE MANY CAPTURES.

In the Navy lists the ship was entered as *Philadelphia*. She sailed from her home city on a cruise to the West Indies in 1800 as flagship of a squadron of 13 vessels under command of Capt. Stephen Decatur, senior. During this cruise she captured 5 vessels from the French.

Her second cruise, 1801–2, was in the Mediterranean under command of Capt. Samuel Barron.

July 28, 1803, she sailed from Philadelphia on her third and last cruise, commanded by Capt. William Bainbridge.

August 26, 1803, shortly after she had reached the Mediterranean, she captured, near Cape de Gatt, the Tripolitan ship *Mesbaha*, or *Murboka*, and recaptured from her the American brig *Cecelia*, of Boston.

TEMPORIZING WITH THE PIRATES.

Up to this time the record of the *Philadelphia* had been one of unvarying successes, and she had come to be regarded as a terror of the seas. It was her business, along with others of the fleet, to protect American merchantmen against privateers and pirates, and the Mediterranean expedition was in the nature of a notice to the Emperor of Morocco and the Arabian beys, who were demanding tribute of the United States, that the American Navy was a power to be reckoned with.

The official reports of the time indicate that the United States under President Jefferson had a great deal of trouble satisfying these mercenary cormorants, who insisted upon the payment of fixed stipends for allowing merchantmen to do business in the Mediterranean. The diplomatic negotiations were of such a nature as to be almost amusing, as we would now view them, because of the strangely worded memorials addressed to the various barbarian rulers with the hope of appeasing their dignity, as well as their appetite for tribute. So unbearable had their exactions become, however, that Commodore Preble was finally sent to meet the situation squarely, and the *Philadelphia* being of his squadron, had tremendous influence in alleviating it.

LURED UPON THE ROCKS.

The consternation following the capture of the *Philadelphia* by the Tripolitans may, therefore, well be imagined. And the incident was all the more distressing because it gave no opportunity to Capt. Bainbridge and his men to fight their way out of captivity. While chasing a Tripolitan ship, on October 31, 1803, the *Philadelphia* ran on an uncharted rock in the harbor of Tripoli. It was commonly asserted, and the Tripolitans sometimes boasted of it, that the *Philadelphia* had been lured to her fate. Be that as it may, every effort was at once made to get her off. In the endeavor to lighten her three anchors were thrown from the bows, the water in the hold started, and guns were hove overboard, except some abaft retained to defend the ship against the gunboats which surrounded her. For four hours Capt. Bainbridge withstood the fire of the Tripolitan ships, gunboats, and the fire from the shore batteries, but seeing that reinforcements were coming out, he decided to strike his flag rather than further endanger the lives of his brave men.

THE NATIVES IN POSSESSION.

The Tripolitans took possession of the frigate shortly after sunset. The officers and a few of the men were taken to the house of the American consul, Mr. Cathcart, ashore, and were quartered there for the night. Next morning, the consul becoming their guaranty to the bashaw for the officers, they were paroled. Forty-three officers and men were placed in the consulate for the time, and 264 men and boys were quartered in the bashaw's palace.

The aggravation resulting from the capture of the *Philadelphia* and the imprisonment of Capt. Bainbridge and his men, was heightened by the refitting of the *Philadelphia* after she was taken from the rocks for the cruising purposes of the Tripolitans. Thus this most formidable champion of the American Navy was made to do service as an enemy of her country, and her hostile flag was flaunted in the very faces of the American captives behind the walls of the bashaw's castle.

The depressing effects of the capture of the *Philadelphia* were felt throughout the United States and by all the foreign countries that had been paying liberal tribute to the Tripolitans; but it was left for Lieut. Stephen Decatur, son of the first commander of the *Philadelphia*, whose brother's life was given to the service in one of these Mediterranean Sea fights, to propose and to organize the expedition which was not only to be eminently successful, but destined to make the name Decatur a synonym for physical courage and bravery the world over.

DECATUR RECAPTURES THE FRIGATE.

Securing the approval of Commodore Preble, Lieut. Decatur, detached from the frigate *Siren*, started out on the night of February 16, 1804, in the captured ketch, renamed the *Intrepid*. Accompanied by 11 officers and 62 men, with an Italian pilot, he sailed into the harbor of Tripoli, boarded the *Philadelphia*, took possession of her after a desperate encounter, set fire to her, and returned to the ketch without the loss of a single man. Twenty of the Tripolitans on the *Philadelphia* were killed, a large boatload escaped, many jumped overboard and were drowned, and one was taken prisoner. Throughout the encounter on the *Philadelphia*, and particularly after the alarm had been sounded and the flames were eating into the rigging, Decatur and his comrades were subjected to the fire of Tripolitan cruisers, gunboats, and batteries on the shore. In an extract from the report of this brilliant and daring exploit it is stated that the guns on the frigate at the time Decatur boarded her were mounted and charged. Whether any of those guns went down with the *Philadelphia* and are still in a state capable of preservation remains to be seen. It is said, however, that the burning of the *Philadelphia* had the most salutary effect upon the pirates and stimulated the officers and men of the American Navy as nothing had done before.

REASON FOR BURNING THE VESSEL.

That Decatur did not save the *Philadelphia*, after driving the pirates off, was due to his literal observance of the orders given

by Commodore Preble. The enterprise was regarded as of so hazardous a nature as to be dubious of execution, and the commodore, fearing that any attempt at capture would result in failure, directed the destruction of the ship. He wanted to make sure, at least, of the effectiveness of American arms.

It would be entertaining in a high degree to recall the testimony of those who accompanied Decatur on his perilous expedition; to describe the sensations of the American captives behind the walls of Tripoli as the fire of the *Philadelphia* illuminated the skies, or to recount the manifestations of delight and approval upon the return of the *Intrepid* to the American squadron; but all that may be passed for the present. The roll of those who acclaimed the heroic deed of Decatur and his men included the Prebles, the Stewarts, the Dales, the Bainbridges, the Porters, the Lawrences, the Perrys, the Smiths, the McDoughs, and many other glorious names of this most thrilling period of America's naval history.

JEFFERSON'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS.

In a message to Congress, March 20, 1804, President Jefferson transmitted the letter of Capt. Bainbridge, announcing the loss of the frigate *Philadelphia*. It was dated Tripoli, November 1, 1803, and was addressed to the Hon. R. Smith, Secretary of the Navy. "Misfortune necessitates me to make a communication the most distressing of my life," Capt. Bainbridge began, and then he proceeded to tell in detail the chase after the Tripolitan cruiser and the rounding up upon the rocks. "We have lost everything but what was on our backs," he concluded, "and even part of that was taken off." In a postscript he added: "Notwithstanding our parole, we are not permitted to leave the house, or go on the top of it, and they have closed our view of the sea." The lament of Capt. Bainbridge was shared by David Porter, then a lieutenant, and others of the captives, who afterwards achieved distinction in naval affairs. In the court-martial proceedings, presided over by Capt. James Barron, it was shown among other things that Capt. Bainbridge had destroyed the signal books of the *Philadelphia* and had, with "great coolness and deliberation," taken other steps to minimize the effect of the loss of the ship to the Tripolitans. The court found that Capt. Bainbridge "acted with fortitude," and "that no degree of censure should attach itself to him."

DECATUR'S ORDERS FROM PREBLE.

Such was the plight of the Navy when the project of the younger Decatur was laid before Commodore Preble. What Decatur was expected to do is shown in the following orders from his commodore:

UNITED STATES FRIGATE "CONSTITUTION,"

Syracuse Harbor, January 31, 1804.

SIR: You are hereby ordered to take command of the prize ketch, which I have named the *Intrepid*, and prepare her with all possible despatch for a cruise of thirty days, with full allowance of water, provisions, &c., for seventy-five men. I shall send you five midshipmen from the *Constitution*, and you will take seventy men, including officers, from the *Enterprise*, if that number can be found ready to volunteer their services for boarding and burning the *Philadelphia* in the harbor of Tripoli; if not, report to me, and I will furnish you with men to complete your complement. It is expected you will be ready to sail tomorrow evening, or some hours sooner, if the signal is made for that purpose.

It is my orders that you proceed to Tripoli, in company with the *Syren*, Lieutenant Stewart, enter the harbor in the night, board the *Philadelphia*, burn her, and make good your retreat, with the *Intrepid*, if possible, unless you can make her the means of destroying the enemy's vessels in the harbor, by converting her into a fireship, for that purpose, and retreating in your boats and those of the *Syren*. You must take fixed ammunition and apparatus for the frigate's 18-pounders, and if you can, without risking too much, you may endeavor to make them the instruments of destruction to the shipping and Bashaw's castle. You will provide all the necessary combustibles for burning and destroying ships. The destruction of the *Philadelphia* is an object of great importance, and I rely with confidence on your intrepidity and enterprise to effect it. Lieutenant Stewart will support you with the boats of the *Syren*, and cover your retreat with that vessel. Be sure and set fire in the gun-room births, cock-pit, store-rooms forward, and births on the birth-deck.

After the ship is well on fire, point two of the 18-pounders, shot, down the main hatch, and blow her bottom out. I enclose you a memorandum of the articles, arms, ammunition, fireworks, &c., necessary, and which you are to take with you. Return to this place as soon as possible, and report to me your proceedings. On boarding the frigate, it is probable you may meet with resistance—it will be well, in order to prevent alarm,

to carry all by the sword. May God prosper and succeed you in this enterprise.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient serv't,

EDWARD PREBLE.

Lieut. Commandant DECATUR,

THE WORK DONE AS ORDERED.

How well the work of destroying the *Philadelphia* was executed is shown by Lieut. Commandant S. Decatur's report to Commodore Preble. It was as follows:

ON BOARD THE KETCH "INTREPID," AT SEA,

February 17, 1804.

SIR: I have the honor to inform you, that in pursuance to your orders of the 31st ultimo, to proceed with this ketch off the harbor of Tripoli, there to endeavor to effect the destruction of the late United States' frigate *Philadelphia*, I arrived there in company with the United States' brig *Syren*, lieutenant-commandant Stewart, on the 7th, but owing to the badness of the weather, was unable to effect any thing until last evening, when we had a light breeze from the N. E. At 7 o'clock I entered the harbor with the *Intrepid*, the *Syren* having gained her station without the harbor, in a situation to support us in our retreat. At half past 9 o'clock, laid her alongside of the *Philadelphia*, boarded, and after a short contest, carried her. I immediately fired her in the store-rooms, gun-room, cock-pit, and birth-deck, and remained on board until the flames had issued from the spar-deck, hatchways, and ports, and before I had got from alongside, the fire had communicated to the rigging and tops. Previous to our boarding, they had got their tompons out, and hailed several times, but not a gun fired.

The noise occasioned by boarding and contending for possession, although no fire-arms were used, gave a general alarm on shore, and on board their cruisers, which lay about a cable and a half's length from us, and many boats filled with men lay around, but from whom we received no annoyance. They commenced a fire on us from all their batteries on shore, but with no other effect than one shot passing through our top-gallant sail.

The frigate was moored within half-gunshot of the Bashaw's castle, and of their principal battery—two of their cruisers lay within two cables' length on the starboard quarter, and their gun-boats within half gunshot on the starboard bow. She had all her guns mounted and loaded, which, as they became hot went off. As she lay with her broadside to the town, I have no doubt but some damage has been done by them. Before I had got out of the harbor, her cables had burnt off, and she had drifted in under the castle, where she was consumed. I can form no judgment as to the number of men on board, but there were twenty killed. A large boat full got off, and many leapt into the sea. We have made one prisoner, and I fear from the number of bad wounds he has received he will not recover, although every assistance and comfort has been given him.

I boarded with sixty men and officers, leaving a guard on board the ketch for her defence, and it is with the greatest pleasure I inform you, I had not a man killed in this affair, and but one slightly wounded. Every support that could be given I received from my officers, and as the conduct of each was highly meritorious, I beg leave to enclose you a list of their names. Permit me also, sir, to speak of the brave fellows I have the honor to command, whose coolness and intrepidity was such as I trust will ever characterise the American tars.

It would be injustice in me, were I to pass over the important services rendered by Mr. Salvadore [Catalano], the pilot, on whose good conduct the success of the enterprise in the greatest degree depended. He gave me entire satisfaction.

I have the honor to be, sir, &c.,

STEPHEN DECATUR.

Com. EDWARD PREBLE,

Com. U. S. Squadron in the Mediterranean.

EXTRACTS FROM PREBLE'S OFFICIAL DESPATCHES.

Reporting the work of Decatur to the department at Washington, Commodore Preble said:

UNITED STATES' SHIP "CONSTITUTION,"

Syracuse Harbor, 19th of February, 1804.

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that the United States' brig *Syren*, lieutenant-commander Stewart, and ketch *Intrepid*, of four guns, lieutenant-commandant Decatur, arrived here last evening from a cruise. They left this port the 3d instant, with my orders to proceed to Tripoli, and burn the frigate, late the United States' frigate *Philadelphia*, at anchor in that harbor. I was well informed that her situation was such as to render it impossible to bring her out, and her destruction being absolutely necessary to favor my intended operations against

that city, I determined the attempt should be made. I enclose you copies of my orders on this occasion, which have been executed in the most gallant and officer-like manner by lieutenant commandant Decatur, assisted by the brave officers and crew of the little ketch *Intrepid*, under his command. Their conduct in the performance of the dangerous service assigned them, cannot be sufficiently estimated. It is beyond all praise. Had lieutenant Decatur delayed one-half hour for the boats of the *Syren* to have joined him, he would have failed in the main object, as a gale commenced immediately after the frigate was on fire, and it was with difficulty the ketch was got out of the harbor. The *Syren*, owing to the lightness of the breeze in the evening, was obliged to anchor at a considerable distance from the city, which prevented her boats from rendering such assistance as they might have done, had they entered the harbor earlier.

Lieutenant Stewart took the best position without the harbor to cover the retreat of the *Intrepid*, that the lightness of the breeze would admit of; his conduct through the expedition has been judicious and highly meritorious. But few of the officers of the squadron could be gratified by sharing in the danger and honor of the enterprise.

In justice to them, I beg leave to observe, that they all offered to volunteer their services on the occasion, and I am confident, whenever an opportunity offers to distinguish themselves, that they will do honor to the service. I enclose you lieutenant commandants Stewart and Decatur's official communications, with names of the officers on board the ketch.

With the highest respect, I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient humble servant.

EDWARD PREBLE.

A STATEMENT OF THE ENEMY'S STRENGTH.

The *Philadelphia* at the time she was destroyed was lying in the harbor of Tripoli, protected not only by her own guns and a considerable number of Turks on board, but by a number of batteries on shore, gunboats, galleys, etc., viz:

	Guns.
Fort English, mounting	7
American	10
Palace	7
Between Palace and Molehead	14
Molehead Crown battery	19
Port Way	11
Two small batteries	9
Malta battery	9
Half-moon battery	10
West Diamond battery	9
Battery with arched embrasures	7
Western battery	7
Of heavy caliber	115
19 gunboats.	
2 galleys.	
2 schooners of 8 guns each and one brig of 10 guns.	

All the batteries and vessels were fully manned; the whole number of troops estimated at 25,000 Arabs, etc. The whole naval force of the United States in the Mediterranean at that period was 1 frigate, 3 brigs, 3 schooners, 2 bombs, and 6 gunboats, manned by 1,060 men. Before the *Philadelphia* was taken by the Tripolitans the demand of the bashaw of Tripoli for peace was \$200,000 and the repayment of all his expenses during the war. After her destruction he agreed to make peace on our terms, viz, exchange of prisoners, man for man, and \$60,000 for the surplus in his possession. The bey of Tunis had frequently threatened war, but was deterred, no doubt, by the impression produced by the energy of our squadron.

Commodore Preble, to the Secretary of the Navy, February 3, 1804, estimates the American captives in Tripoli at 300; the Tripolitan captives, 60; balance of prisoners in favor of Tripoli, 240.

So much for a better understanding of the importance and effectiveness of Decatur's work. It terrified the pirates and brought them to terms.

THE LOG OF THE SLOOP "SIREN."

Amongst the tomes of the Navy Department is still preserved the original log of the U. S. sloop of war *Siren* (spelled *Syren* in the log, spelled *Syren* elsewhere—J. H. M.) of 18 guns, then under the command of Lieut. Charles Stewart, afterwards a famous commodore, and from it I have been permitted to make the following extract, which tells in the language of the sailor the story of Decatur's wonderful adventure:

"THURSDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY, 1804.

"Commences with fresh breeze, clear X pleas^t weather, the *Intrepid* in co: At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 2 made the land on our lee bow, haul'd up the main sail took 1 reef in the topsails & bent the stream cable. At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 3 backed the main topsail for the *Intrepid* to come up. At 4 lower'd down the cutter & sent 9

men on board the *Intrepid* with cutlasses, pistols, muskets, &c., &c. At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 4 the boat return'd hoisted her up & made sail for the land. At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 5 mountain Togura 6 or 8 miles to the Ed. of Tripoli bore S.S.W. town of Tripoli S.W. At 6 tack'd to the N.W. At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 7 boarded main tack. At $\frac{1}{2}$ p^t 9 tk'd to the S.W. set stay sails & jib. At 10 call'd all hands to quarters & run out the guns, haul'd down stay sails & jib & haul'd up square main sail, brail'd up after main sail. At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 10 spoke the *Intrepid*. At 11 back'd the main topsail sounded and got no bottom. Midnight moderate and clear, lost sight of the *Intrepid*, haul'd up the fore sail & back'd main top sail sounded in 35 fathoms & fill'd away. At 1 sounded in 14, 12 & 9 fathoms /from 1 to 4 standing off & on the shore, showing lights for the *Intrepid*/ which were answered/ At 1 call'd all hands to quarters, run in the guns & secur'd them. Shipp'd the ports, wore and stood off shore, made sail, the *Intrepid* on our lee bow. At 8 the high land near Tripoli bore S.W. by W. 7 leagues. At 11 the *Intrepid* tk'd to the S^d and E^d Meridian wore to the S^d and W^d Handed square main sail, reef'd the fore sail & set after main sail moderate breezes & pleas^t the *Intrepid* bearing S. $\frac{1}{2}$ E 8 miles dis^t Latt: Obs. 33° 21'."

THE "INTREPID" RETURNS TO THE "SIREN."

"REMARKS ON BOARD,

"Friday 17th Feb: 1804.

"Commences with fine breezes & pleas^t weather the *Intrepid* in co: At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 1 set jib & main top mast stay sail. $\frac{1}{2}$ past 2 haul'd them down. At 4 made the town of Tripoli at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 5 it bore S.W. by S. $\frac{1}{2}$ S. English castle S.S.W. 12 miles dis^t At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 6 back'd main top sail & hoisted out barge & launch. At 7 turn'd the reef out of the topsails & sounded in 38 fathoms. small irregular stones. small shells & red & white coral, the town of Tripoli bearing S.S.W. 9 miles. At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 7 sounded in 33 fathoms, set jib & after main sail. 8 sounded in 26 fathoms, fine yellowish coral, small shells & gravel. Tripoli bore S.S.W. 5 miles dis^t At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 8 sounded in 20 fathoms, haul'd up the fore sail, down jib, brail'd after main sail. At 9 came too with the stream anchor in 22 fathoms, small yellow coral & fine sand. Tripoli bearing S.W. by S. 1 mile distant inclin'g to calm, sent off to Lieu^t Decatur reinforcements in the boats. Lieu^t Caldwell & Jno. Dorsey mid^s with 20 men /in the launch/ Mr. Brooke & Mr. Budd with 8 men /in the Barge/ At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 10 Lieu^t Decatur made the signal for a reinforcement of officers & men in boats, answer'd it, about ten minutes after which the Frigate *Philadelphia* in the harbour of Tripoli burst into a flame fore & aft, the castle & Batteries then commenc'd the fire on the *Intrepid*, all around the frigate & in every direction. Midnight, gentle breezes & pleas^t weather. Weigh'd and stood to the N^d & E^d under easy sail. At $\frac{1}{2}$ past midnight the launch and barge return'd and were welcomed with repeated cheers /hoisted in boats/ At 1 a. m. spoke the *Intrepid* & took her in tow, when Lieu^t Decatur came on board got top gall^t masts on end & made sail. Town of Tripoli bearing S.S.W. dis^t 2 leagues. At 4 hous'd the guns and shipp'd the ports. At 9 haul'd down main top mast stay sail & brail'd up after main sail, stiff gales from the S.S.E. At $\frac{1}{2}$ past 9 set main top mast stay sail. At 10 run out the jib boom bent the standing jib & set it, at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 11 double reef'd after main sail & set it.

"N. B. About midnight the frigate burnt her cables & drifted ashore she was then burnt down to the water's edge. Latt: Obs. 34° 25'."

A BORN SAILOR AND FIGHTER.

At the time of his great achievement Stephen Decatur was 25 years of age. He was a born sailor and fighter, having been recognized throughout the Navy as one of the most gallant and intrepid of leaders. He had been in active service long before the Tripoli affair, and continued in the service after his promotion two grades, and about 10 years in recognition of it, until 1820, when on March 22, in a duel with Commodore Barron at Bladensburg he lost his life. The duel was one of those deplorable tragedies, due largely to the false chivalry characteristic of the times. The death of Decatur was universally deplored. He was buried at Kalorama, in the District of Columbia; but having, in connection with his proposed participation in the management of the congressional burial ground at Washington, expressed a desire to be buried near the tomb of his parents, at St. Peter's Church, in Philadelphia, his body was subsequently removed to that place. It was received at Philadelphia with military and civic honors, and a popular movement was at once instituted to erect a monument befitting his life and character. On each return of his birthday, January 5, the ladies of the Stephen Decatur Chapter of the Daughters of 1812 are accustomed to visit and decorate the grave. The monument consists of an ionic column, surmounted by an American eagle.

THE MONUMENT AT OLD ST. PETERS.

The inscriptions upon the sides of the column are as follows:

STEPHEN DECATUR
Born January 5th, 1779
Entered the Navy of the United States
as Midshipman
April 3rd, 1798
Became Lieutenant
June 3rd, 1799
Made Captain
For Distinguished Merit
Passing over the Rank of Commander
February 16th, 1804
Died
March 22nd, 1820
Devoted to His Country
By a
Patriotic Father
He Cherished in His Heart
and Sustained by His
Intrepid Action
The Inspiring Sentiment
"Our Country! Right or Wrong"
A Nation
Gave Him in Return
Its Applause and Gratitude
The Gallant Officer
Whose Prompt and Active Valor
Always on the Watch
Was Guided By a Wisdom
And Supported by a Firmness
Which Never Tired
Whose Efforts in Arms
Reflected
The Daring Fictions of
Romance and Chivalry
A Name
Brilliant from a series of
Heroic Deeds
On the Coast of Barbary
and Illustrious
By Achievements Against
More Disciplined Enemies
The Pride of the Navy
The Glory of the
Republic.

EFFORTS TO LOCATE THE WRECK.

Mr. Chairman, several efforts have been made since the death of Decatur to locate the wreck of the *Philadelphia*. In June, 1905, Charles Wellington Furlong made an examination of the Barbary coast at Tripoli through the courtesy of Muchia Redjed Pasha, commander in chief of the Turkish forces in Tripoli. In that inspection, in which he was aided by marine divers, Mr. Furlong discovered the location of the wreck and managed to recover a cannon ball from her timbers in addition to some copper nails. His investigation, however, did not result in any steps being taken to recover the hull. After the Turks were driven out of Tripoli in the recent war with Italy, Mr. Harold Sherwood Spencer, who was attached to one of the New York newspapers, interested himself in the matter, consulting the American consul at Tripoli, in Barbary, and the American ambassador to Italy, as appears from the following correspondence:

TRIPOLI, BARBARY, October 10, 1912.

MY DEAR MR. O'BRIEN: Within a very few weeks the Italians, in their work of improving the harbor, will reach the site of the wreck of our famous frigate *Philadelphia*.

Although the wreck is at present in a good state of preservation, and only in 10 feet of water, the proposed harbor improvements will tear up the old ship piecemeal, burying part of it under a breakwater.

To me, and I hope you feel likewise, a ship of such a glorious past as our *Philadelphia* should be raised and buried at sea. At least the keel and some of her old cannon might be taken to Annapolis or Washington as relics.

It seems fit that our ambassador to Italy should recover our ship from what are now Italian waters. If you are interested will you please wire me, care of the consul here.

Respectfully,

HAROLD SHERWOOD SPENCER.

STATE AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS INTERESTED.

NOVEMBER 23, 1912.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the letter of November 19 (3809/315:1) in which, referring to this department's letter of the 13th instant, you advise me that the naval attaché at Rome has been instructed by telegraph to proceed to Tripoli and investigate the possibility of raising the wreck of the *Philadelphia* from the harbor at that port.

As of possible interest in this connection, I take occasion to inclose herewith a copy of a dispatch on this subject which has now been received from the American consul at Tripoli.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

HUNTINGTON WILSON,
Acting Secretary of State.

AMERICAN CONSULATE,
Tripoli-in-Barbary, October 16, 1912.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

SIR: I have the honor to report to the department that Mr. Harold Sherwood Spencer is desirous of making an effort to rescue the remains of the old U. S. S. frigate *Philadelphia*, which was wrecked off the harbor of Tripoli October 31, 1803, captured by the Tripoli pirates with whom we were at war and brought into port, and in February, 1804, destroyed by burning through the daring and famous exploit of Lieut. Decatur.

Mr. Spencer was a student at Annapolis for several years, but resigned in the latter part of 1910 for the purpose of preparing to enter the diplomatic service. He has, however, since then been engaged in newspaper and literary work, and was sent here last November by Mr. Bennett as special war correspondent of the New York Herald. He left Tripoli in December and returned to New York in June of this year, where he has a temporary residence at the Vanderbilt Hotel.

Mr. Spencer desires to present the remains of the *Philadelphia* to the Naval Institute, of which he is a member, or to the museum of the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Believing this project to be a most worthy enterprise, I presented Mr. Spencer to Governor General Ragni and requested permission for him to raise the *Philadelphia*. The request was most graciously accorded by His Excellency, who displayed much interest in the enterprise. Later he asked us to go on the terrace of the castle for the purpose of having pointed out the precise location of the wreck, which lies in about 10 feet of water very near the Spanish fort. The governor general also stated that he would be pleased to assist Mr. Spencer in his efforts.

Preliminary surveys are being made to determine what part of the wreck can be rescued and the approximate cost of the work.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN Q. WOOD,
American Consul.

DECEMBER —, 1912.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

SIR: Referring to previous correspondence concerning project for raising the wreck of the U. S. frigate *Philadelphia* from the harbor of Tripoli, I have the honor to inclose herewith for your information a copy of a report on this subject from the American consul at Tripoli, under date of the 30th ultimo.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

P. C. KNOX.

NAVAL ATTACHÉ MAKES ESTIMATE.

AMERICAN CONSULATE,
Tripoli in Barbary, November 30, 1912.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

SIR: I have the honor to report the arrival of our naval attaché at Rome, Lieut. Richard Drace White, in pursuance of orders from the Navy Department, to examine and report on the project of raising the U. S. frigate *Philadelphia*. Commander White was received most cordially by Gov. Gen. Ragni and has been given every possible assistance. The command of the port has been placed at his disposition, and during the examination of the wreck, on the 29th instant, the day after arrival, the gasoline launch of the governor general was sent to Commander White, with instructions to the officer in charge to report to him for orders.

It has been possible to locate the wreck, and the firm of Almagia, now engaged on the port works, has given an estimate

of the cost of raising the remains of the old frigate. It has appeared to me to be very excessive, although I confess to a lack of experience in such matters, and therefore would not care to advance an opinion as to a reasonable cost of successfully carrying out such a project.

I would state that the arrival of Commander White has created a great local interest in the history of our naval and military operations in this country, and especially in the outcome of the inspection and report that will be sent to the Navy Department by our naval attaché. A copy of *La Nuova Italia* is herewith inclosed, containing an article on the *Philadelphia*, which may be of some interest, although several of the facts are not accurate. On account of lack of time it has been impossible to make a translation.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN Q. WOOD,

American Consul.

ITALIAN OFFICIALS AND NEWSPAPERS FRIENDLY.

Along with the correspondence just quoted is a translation of the article from *La Nuova Italia*, of Tripoli, Africa, dated November 29, 1912, which, under the heading "A glorious page of American history rises from the bottom of the Libian Sea," reviews in eloquent terms the gallantry of Decatur and his crew and bespeaks the utmost courtesy on the part of Gen. Ragni, the Italian commander, should the American Government desire to take steps in the matter. In addition I have a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who has expressed his approval of an appropriation for the raising of the *Philadelphia*, in which he transmits, at my request, a copy of the report of the naval attaché who recently undertook an inspection of the hull of the *Philadelphia* and who was instructed to report as to the conditions surrounding it. This report, which is appended in full, indicates clearly that the hull and such relics as may remain in it can be recovered for twelve or fifteen thousand dollars, provided the recovery is attempted before the Italian Government proceeds with the construction work which may obliterate the wreck forever.

EXISTING CONDITIONS SURROUNDING THE HULL.

ROME, December 9, 1912.

From: Naval attaché, Rome and Vienna.

To: Director of Naval Intelligence.

Subject: Proposed salvaging of the wreck of the U. S. S. *Philadelphia* in the harbor of Tripoli, in Barbary.

Reference: O. N. I. telegram of November 16, 1912.

1. I have proceeded according to the instructions contained in the reference.

2. In the work of investigating the wreck, the commander in chief of the naval force in Tripoli, the governor, and the commanding general of the military force have been extremely courteous and have facilitated the work. I have been greatly aided by the American consul, Mr. John Q. Wood, and by Mr. Harold S. Spencer, who had very thoroughly investigated the wreck previous to my arrival. These two gentlemen devoted all their time to helping and advising me while I was engaged in this work. I was also greatly aided by Mr. William S. Riley, an Englishman resident in Tripoli for 25 years, who has become interested in the work.

BURIED IN TWO AND A HALF FATHOMS.

3. I find that the wreck lies in about 2½ fathoms of water on the bearings indicated in the inclosure marked "B." This part of the bay is soon to be filled in and warehouses, railways, etc., built thereon. No excavations are to be made here, however, as was at first reported.

4. It appears that she lies on her side (thought to be starboard, though this is uncertain), her keel in a line approximately northeast and southwest. She is entirely covered by sand, except for a portion approximately 35 feet in length on the above-mentioned bearing and 15 feet in width, in which space portions are visible in places projecting above the sand bottom in some cases as much as 1½ feet.

WHAT THE DIVERS DISCOVERED.

5. There are three or four projections visible, which appear to be ribs or frames of the hull. These appear to curve upward, which leads me to believe that they are situated near the bow or the stern. This is, however, only a surmise, as the curvature may only be apparent. There are several planks which extend in a northeasterly direction and end abruptly. Beyond their end is a rectangular piece lying at right angles to the lengthwise direction of the planks.

6. The divers who investigated the wreck report that the whole wreck is imbedded in sand in the form of a mound, which slopes off in all directions from the wreck. They sawed off portions and found the planking covered with copper in a state

of partial decomposition, and also found the remains of nails now corroded so that they are nothing but hardened rust.

7. The divers who made the examination; the engineer in charge of the divers, Mr. Spencer; Mr. Riley; the American consul, Mr. John Q. Wood; and I are agreed in the opinion that the part visible is the remains of the ribs and skin of the ship. The planking which ends so abruptly we believe to have sprung loose, or been pried loose, from the frames and to have straightened out more or less. We conclude that the ship sunk on the original bottom of the harbor, which slopes away abruptly to the northeast, with one end much lower than the other, and that the sand which now covers her has sifted in, making the harbor at this point much shallower than it was at the time she sank.

8. Granting that the ship was 40 feet in beam and 200 feet long, she must extend in the sand to a depth of approximately 40 feet, and for a length of approximately 200 feet.

9. When Mr. Spencer, in his letter to the American ambassador to Rome, dated October 10, suggested raising her, he was of the opinion that the ship rested on an approximately even keel and did not extend deep into the sand, and his idea was that she could be scooped out and lifted with shears and got on shore intact. The belief that she lies on her side, however, and must extend deep into the sand bottom makes that project appear impracticable, and it is now believed that the best way to attempt to raise her is to dredge around her and inside her as much as practicable and then raise her with floats and chains, if practicable, intact; otherwise, in sections cut adrift before being lifted.

LOCAL COMPANY COULD DO THE WORK.

10. In this connection the lack of facilities available at Tripoli for work of this character has been considered. There is a floating crane of 75 (I am told) tons capacity. There are some small lighters; there are some small cranes on shore. That is practically all. There is also to be considered the weather, which is very bad at this season, and the fact that a company is under contract to fill in the space where the wreck lies within a certain period and with perfect right to interfere with any operations which would delay them in their work.

11. This company, viz, Ditta Almagia, have, at my request, made an estimate as to what they would charge to raise her. Their estimate is \$12,000 to raise her entirely and put her on the beach. The project is to raise her intact, but this may become impracticable, in which case it would be necessary to raise her piece by piece. Their estimate is based on the assumption that there would be 4,000 cubic meters to excavate, at a cost of \$2.50 per cubic meter, and that the cost of raising her and putting her ashore would be \$2,000. They also estimate that they could raise a section 45 feet in length along the part now projecting above the water for \$5,000. And I am of the opinion that for \$2,000 that part projecting above the bottom and a considerable portion adjacent thereto could be raised.

12. In addition to the cost above enumerated there would be the cost of conveying the material recovered to the United States. The local agencies could give me no data on this problem, but I am in communication with agents in Malta and Naples and will make this question subject of future report.

ITALIAN GOVERNMENT WOULD APPROVE.

13. I am of the opinion that, if it is the department's wish to raise her, or any part of her, it can best be done by contract with the above-mentioned firm. They are, so far as I can learn, the only company there with facilities necessary to undertake it. They can take care of such parts as are recovered until such time as they can be shipped to the United States, and above all they can interfere and forbid the work being carried on by any other company on the strength of the fact that they are under contract to fill in that part of the harbor where the wreck lies, and may commence at that spot whenever they choose.

14. As a matter of fact, they will not, in the ordinary course of events, reach the spot where the *Philadelphia* lies for a long time, and if they take the contract to raise her, they would not undertake it until next February, because in this season of storms the work would surely be interfered with and most likely would prove to be impracticable. Once started on the work, they estimate that it would require two weeks to raise the whole wreck, and a less time for a less part.

15. In case it is wished to attempt to raise the wreck, there will be, I believe, practically no difficulty in obtaining the necessary permission from the Italian Government. In fact, the idea of our raising her has produced a very favorable impression not only at Tripoli, but throughout Italy.

16. I await instructions before proceeding further in the matter.

R. DRACE WHITE.

HEROISM AND GALLANTRY VERSUS MATERIALISM.

The remains of Stephen Decatur repose in the old third district of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent in Congress. I have often stood by the monument reared in his honor by the citizens of Philadelphia, and upon which the garlands of admiration and esteem are annually laid by the patriotic women of the Stephen Decatur Chapter, Daughters of 1812, and have wondered if succeeding generations have fully appreciated the value of the life and services of this brave man. He was one of those heroes around whose memory cluster the hallowed traditions which lift us above the field of materialism. Indeed, the story of his life and that of the frigate *Philadelphia* tend to renew our faith in the American Navy and in the patriotism and fighting qualities of our officers and enlisted men. It does us good to preach the heroism of Stephen Decatur. It aids us to a better understanding of the purposes of those who engage their services in the dangerous work of the Army or the Navy. And when we consider it in relation to more recent heroes of the Navy of the United States it helps us to forget that the world of peace is selfish and overdone in money getting.

CUSHING AND HOBSON IN DECATUR CLASS.

The century just closed gave us three heroes of the Decatur type—Decatur himself, Cushing, and Hobson. There have been many others, participants in the various wars in which our country engaged from 1800 to 1900, but in no three particulars are the exploits of heroism so easily comparable as in the instances of Decatur, Cushing, and Hobson. With respect to personal daring and bravery, in the execution of well-conceived but hazardous plans, there is very little difference between Decatur's burning of the *Philadelphia* in 1804, Cushing's blowing up of the *Albatross* in 1864, and Hobson's sinking of the *Merrimac* in 1898. Each invaded hostile territory and shared personally the perils of the brave handful of men who accompanied the expedition. Each succeeded in his undertaking, and thus added to the honor and glory of American arms.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that if we can freshen the American mind and fire the American heart by the recovery of relics of the historic frigate *Philadelphia* it would amply repay the small expenditure that is contemplated. The bringing back to America of whatever may be found of this famous old fighting craft would add to our respect for the flag of our common country and intensify our appreciation of and regard for its fighting men. If the recovery of no more than one of the 44 original cannon is effected, it will be worth all the money that is asked for the purpose.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, Oklahoma bears burden of the Nation in the loss of school lands, in the insignificant amount received from the percentage on sale of public lands and in enormous loss of revenue by reason of vast area of nontaxable Indian lands. To remove this burden from the people of Oklahoma I have introduced three bills, to which I wish to call the attention of the House at this time.

Each one of these bills provides for a large appropriation to the State of Oklahoma. These appropriations are to pay to the State of Oklahoma certain amounts which I maintain are justly due the State on account of matters growing out of the terms and conditions under which Oklahoma was admitted as a State into the Union. At the outset, I will state that I do not charge that Congress intentionally did an injustice to Oklahoma. Nothing I shall say will be intended as a criticism upon the Committee on Territories in 1906, that had the Oklahoma Enabling Act in charge, and especially nothing I say must be regarded as, in any way, a criticism upon the gentleman from Michigan, the Hon. EDWARD L. HAMILTON, the chairman of the Committee on Territories at the time. The people of Oklahoma are greatly indebted to him for services rendered, and our people hold him in the highest esteem. And finally nothing I say is intended as a reflection upon the work of my colleague, Mr. McGUIRE, who was the delegate from Oklahoma Territory, at the time the Oklahoma Statehood bill was passed. Rather would I praise him for his splendid work in connection with Oklahoma's statehood act.

THIRTY-ONE MILLION ASKED FOR.

The three bills which I have introduced carry a total appropriation to the State of Oklahoma of over \$31,000,000. This is a large sum of money. I have not introduced these bills hastily. I have given the matter the most careful consideration. I have acted only after I concluded that each of the claims have real merit, and that as a Representative from the State of Oklahoma my duty to the people and the taxpayers of that State demanded that I should introduce these bills, and with whatever

ability I may have press them for favorable consideration before the Congress of the United States, the only tribunal that has jurisdiction to pass upon these claims.

GENERAL STATEMENT.

In the act approved June 16, 1906, which provided for the admission of Oklahoma as a State into the Union, Congress appropriated \$5,000,000 to the State of Oklahoma for public-school purposes, in lieu of sections 16 and 36 in each township in the Indian Territory, which had been conveyed to certain Indian Tribes and were not therefore available as a grant to the State for public-school purposes. In round numbers, sections 16 and 36 in the Indian Territory comprised about 1,100,000 acres of land. Congress allowed the State about \$4.60 per acre for these lands. This, I contend, was only about one-third their value. The amount of the appropriation should have been equal to the value of these lands. I maintain, therefore, that the people of Oklahoma have a just claim against the United States for the difference between the \$5,000,000 and the real value of these lands, which I estimate was about \$16,000,000, or \$15 per acre. This, in brief, is the basis for my bill (H. R. 27950), which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay Oklahoma \$11,000,000, and makes appropriation therefor.

PER CENT OF PROCEEDS OF SALES OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Beginning with the act of Congress passed in 1802, which provided for the admission of the State of Ohio into the Union, Congress has granted to all the public-land States an amount equal to 5 per cent on the net proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within the State. With the exception of Oklahoma, all these public-land States were admitted, early in their history, when the population was small and when only a small part of the public lands lying within the States had been entered. While the percentage, except as to Nebraska and Arizona, was granted on sales subsequent to statehood, in effect the States received a percentage on practically all the lands within the States, as prior to statehood comparatively few of the lands had been entered.

Not so with Oklahoma. In the first place, Congress had conveyed all the public lands in the Indian Territory to the Indians, constituting about half the area of the State. This reduced by half the amount which Oklahoma would have otherwise received. In the second place, at the time of statehood, in what was formerly Oklahoma Territory, nearly all the public lands had been entered and final proof made thereon. As a result, this grant to Oklahoma of an amount equal to 5 per cent on the sales of public lands is insignificant compared with the amount received by the 28 other public-land States. To correct this injustice, I have introduced H. R. 28669, which provides in substance that Oklahoma shall have 5 per cent on sales of public lands lying within the State, sold either prior or subsequent to date of statehood.

NONTAXABLE INDIAN LANDS.

The most important of all these three bills is H. R. 28670, which provides for an appropriation of \$20,000,000 to the State of Oklahoma, payable in 16 annual payments of \$1,250,000 each.

This claim is based upon the proposition that the Indian lands in Oklahoma are nontaxable by virtue of stipulations in treaties made by the United States with the Indians; that the Federal Government has no power or authority to exempt from taxation land within a State, after the United States had sold or disposed of the lands, except by consent of the State, and except on terms and conditions prescribed by the State and upon payment of such consideration as shall be satisfactory to the State; and, finally, that to provide the Indians with nontaxable lands is a duty belonging to the Federal and not the State government, and that whatever it costs to provide nontaxable lands for the Indians should be paid by the National Government and not by the people of the State governments. The object of this \$20,000,000 appropriation is, in a measure at least, to pay to the State of Oklahoma and the various county, township, and school district governments for loss in revenue from nontaxable Indian lands.

SCHOOL LANDS APPROPRIATED FOR NATIONAL USE.

It is important that we first clearly comprehend the fact that the Federal Government used the public lands in the Indian Territory for a national purpose. To all intents and purposes these lands were used by the Government to pay a national debt. The United States in effect sold these lands to the Indians, and received a valuable consideration therefor. The Indians secured these lands through contract, agreement, and treaty. The Indians paid a consideration therefor, they released title to other lands, they relinquished homes elsewhere, or otherwise made concessions which were valuable to the Nation.

But, leaving out the question of consideration, in dealing with the Indian the United States had a duty to perform, an obligation to discharge, a responsibility to meet. In discharging what was clearly a national duty, a national obligation, a national responsibility, the public lands in the Indian Territory were conveyed to the Indians.

The public school lands in the Indian Territory, solemnly dedicated to the sacred purpose of promoting education among the people of the State, were diverted from this great purpose and converted by the United States to another and entirely different purpose. These lands belonged to the State; they were used by the Nation. Dedicated solely to the use of the people of the State, they were appropriated for the use and benefit of all the people of the United States. Deprived of these lands, the people of the State have the right to expect full compensation therefor. If full compensation is not made to the people of the State for the loss of these lands then the Federal Government will be compelling the people of Oklahoma to pay, as a price for statehood, a debt that clearly belonged to the Nation and should have been paid by all the 93,000,000 people of the United States.

THREE GENERAL PROPOSITIONS.

The arguments in support of the bill (H. R. 27950) to appropriate \$11,000,000 to compensate the State of Oklahoma for difference between the value of school lands in the Indian Territory and the \$5,000,000 appropriated, I will present under three general propositions.

First. By virtue of what might be called the common law of the country—a law established by more than a century of precedent, custom, and usage, reenforced by a well-defined national policy—the people of Oklahoma were entitled to sections 16 and 36 in each township in the Indian Territory for public school purposes, or in lieu thereof an amount of money equal to their reasonable value at date of statehood.

Second. Other public-land States, in the number of acres granted to them for public school purposes, and in the per capita grant to such States, based upon population in 1910, and also in the per capita grant based upon school population, received vastly larger grants of land for public school purposes than did Oklahoma.

Third. The 1,100,000 acres of public school lands in the Indian Territory were reasonably worth about \$15 per acre—or in the aggregate about \$16,000,000—or about \$11,000,000 more than the \$5,000,000 granted in the enabling act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, does the gentleman, in referring to lost school lands, mean by that sections 16 and 36 in the Indian Territory part of Oklahoma.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, to Oklahoma, as distinct from the Indian Territory, sections 16 and 36 were given, were they not?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. They were.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Did not Oklahoma Territory get a greater quantity of land than two sections in a township?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Not for public-school purposes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. What was it for?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Oklahoma received certain grants for the higher educational institutions, certain grants for the public-building fund.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Were not some of those grants made upon the express condition or because of the fact that Oklahoma would not receive sections 16 and 36 in what was the Indian Territory?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I think not.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. For a question, certainly.

Mr. CARTER. For a short statement. These land grants, as I remember, were made prior to the time when the enabling act was passed.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Do you mean the grants to the Indians?

Mr. CARTER. The land grants to the State for all kinds of school purposes were made prior to the time the enabling act was passed.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. When the lands were opened to settlement the school lands were reserved. The actual grant—the legal conveyance—was by grant in the statehood act.

Mr. CARTER. The point I want to make is this: The grant of each of these sections was made for school purposes to the Territory of Oklahoma prior to the time of statehood. The grants were made, in other words, when the opening of the res-

ervations came about. Now—just a moment, if the gentleman will permit me—at the time these openings were had no one could say that Indian Territory was to be any part of the new State of Oklahoma; in fact, a very strong effort was being made to make separate States of Indian Territory and Oklahoma, so any land grants which might have been made at that time to Oklahoma Territory could not have been given in lieu of any conditions that existed in the Indian Territory prior to statehood.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. CARTER. Is not that correct, I will ask my friend from Oklahoma?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. That is correct; yes.

Mr. CARTER rose.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I would like to yield to my colleague, but it will take all my time to go over the ground I wish to cover.

Mr. CARTER. Just a question. I desire to ask the gentleman if he arrived at the acreage and figures given by calculating sections 16 and 36?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes; I estimate the number of acres comprised in sections 16 and 36 in the Indian Territory.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. For just a moment.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman state what disposition the State of Oklahoma made of this \$5,000,000? Did it go to the public-school fund?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. It went to the public-school fund.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman state whether or not he has made any inquiry to ascertain the average price the other States received for their public-school lands?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I will come to that after a while.

Mr. MURDOCK. How about Kansas?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Kansas received 2,876,124 acres.

Mr. MURDOCK. However, we did not get the \$5,000,000.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Kansas received 500,000 acres of public lands for internal improvements, which I think went to your school fund. Your State also received other large grants, which I shall later refer to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the gentleman make a comparison between the school funds resulting from the Government gratuity?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I expected that question to arise. Some of the States have lost much of their school funds. There are instances of mismanagement. But should the grant to Oklahoma for public-school purposes be measured by mistakes made by the people or public officers of the older States? Certainly not. Oklahoma is entitled to the grant of the regular school lands given to other States, or their equivalent in cash. The mistakes of others should be a warning to the people of Oklahoma, but should not be used as an excuse for limiting the grant, either in lands or in money.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. The State of Kansas was not brought into the Union with one-half of its lands nontaxable?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. No. I will come to that directly.

USAGE AND PRECEDENT SUPPORT CLAIM.

Oklahoma's claim to school lands in the Indian Territory is sustained by a full century of precedent, practice, usage, and custom.

The precedent for granting certain lands in each township for public-school purposes antedates the adoption of the Constitution and the organization of the Federal Government thereunder. In 1785 the Congress adopted an ordinance providing for the survey of the territory northwest of the Ohio River. This ordinance declared that lot 16 should be reserved for public-school purposes. In 1787, two years later, Congress passed another ordinance providing for the government of the Northwest Territory. This ordinance designated certain articles therein which should be regarded as articles of compact between the Original States and the State and the people of the Northwest Territory, which articles should remain unalterable except by common consent. One of these articles declared that—

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

Thus our forefathers, 128 years ago—before the adoption of the Constitution—before the organization of the Government thereunder—established a precedent and inaugurated a national

policy which have been followed ever since, and which have been potent factors in the spread of knowledge, in the promotion of education, in the enlightenment of our citizenship, and in adding strength, greatness, and glory to our country.

In 1802 Congress passed an act for the admission of Ohio as a State into the Union. This act granted section 16 in each township for public-school purposes.

From 1802 to 1848—a period of 46 years—in admitting public-land States Congress uniformly granted to the States section 16 in each township for public-school purposes.

In 1848 a new precedent was established—a new policy was adopted. The grant for public schools was enlarged. In that year the State of Oregon was admitted to the Union under an enabling act which granted both sections 16 and 36 in each township for the use of public schools.

The Oregon enabling act became a model for subsequent statehood acts. For from 1848 down to 1913—two-thirds of a century—in admitting public-land States into the Union Congress has followed the Oregon act and granted to the new States sections 16 and 36 in each township for public-school purposes, except that Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico were granted four sections in each township for public schools.

OKLAHOMA RECEIVES LESS THAN OTHER STATES.

The number of acres of land granted to Oklahoma for public-school purposes is not one-third the average number of acres granted to the various States admitted to the Union since 1848.

I have prepared a table showing the number of acres of land granted to the public-land States admitted since 1848 for public-school purposes. This table shows the population of these States in 1910, with the per capita grant to these States. The table is as follows:

Table showing number of acres the several States received from sections 16 and 36, and Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico with sections 2, 16, 32, and 36, with population of States in 1910, and number of acres per capita.

State.	Acres.	Population.	Per capita.
Utah.....	6,007,182	273,351	16
Montana.....	5,102,107	376,053	13.5
New Mexico.....	4,309,369	327,301	13.4
Arizona.....	4,050,346	204,354	28.8
Nevada.....	3,985,422	81,875	48.6
Colorado.....	3,715,555	799,024	4.6
Oregon.....	3,387,520	672,765	5.03
Wyoming.....	3,368,924	145,965	23.6
Idaho.....	3,063,271	325,594	9.4
Kansas.....	2,876,124	1,690,949	1.7
South Dakota.....	2,813,511	583,888	4.8
Nebraska.....	2,637,155	1,192,214	2.2
North Dakota.....	2,531,200	577,056	4.3
Washington.....	2,448,675	1,141,990	2.1
Oklahoma.....	1,276,204	1,657,155	.77
Total number of acres.....	51,572,565		

Average acres for each State, 3,438,171.
Acres granted to Oklahoma, 1,276,204.

Utah received 6,007,182 acres; Montana received 5,102,107 acres. Arizona and New Mexico each received over 4,000,000 acres. Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, and Wyoming each received over 3,000,000 acres; Kansas received 2,876,124 acres; South Dakota, 2,813,511 acres; Nebraska, 2,637,155; North Dakota, 2,531,200; and Washington, 2,448,675 acres. Oklahoma received 1,276,204 acres.

Utah received the largest acreage for public-school purposes, Oklahoma the smallest. In acreage Utah's grant was more than four times that of Oklahoma. The average acreage granted to these States was 3,438,171 acres, three times the acreage received by Oklahoma.

PER CAPITA GRANT.

The number of acres per capita granted to the people of Oklahoma for common-school purposes is only one-sixteenth the per capita grant to the people of the other States for the same purpose.

The per capita grant for common-school purposes to the various States is as follows:

Nevada, 48.6 acres; Arizona, 28.8 acres; Wyoming, 23.6 acres; Utah, 16 acres; Montana, 13.5 acres; New Mexico, 13.4 acres; Idaho, 9.4 acres; Oregon, 5.03 acres; South Dakota, 4.8 acres; Colorado, 4.6 acres; North Dakota, 4.3 acres; Nebraska, 2.2 acres; Washington, 2.1 acres; Kansas, 1.7 acres; and Oklahoma, only 0.7 of an acre.

Nevada received the largest per capita grant, 48.6 acres. Oklahoma received the smallest per capita grant, seven-tenths of an acre. The per capita grant to Nevada was 70 times the per capita grant to Oklahoma. The average per capita grant to the various States was 11.2 acres. The average per capita

grant to these States was 16 times the per capita acreage granted to Oklahoma.

If this is fair and equitable, then you must say that 1 acre of land in Oklahoma is worth 16 acres of average land in 14 of the best States west of the Mississippi River.

PER CAPITA GRANT BASED ON SCHOOL POPULATION.

The number of acres per capita granted to Oklahoma, based upon the number of persons of school age in 1910, is only one twenty-fourth the per capita grant to the other 14 States based upon school population.

I have prepared a table showing the number of acres of land granted for public-school purposes, the school population based upon the census of 1910, and the per capita grant to each State based upon the number of persons of school age in said States in 1910.

The table is as follows:

Table showing grant per capita according to the number of persons of school age in certain States in 1910.

States.	Acres.	School population.	Per capita.
Utah.....	6,007,182	121,016	49.6
Montana.....	5,102,107	93,771	54.4
New Mexico.....	4,309,369	105,403	40.8
Arizona.....	4,050,346	56,897	71
Nevada.....	3,985,422	16,132	247
Colorado.....	3,715,555	215,940	17.2
Oregon.....	3,387,520	175,386	19.3
Wyoming.....	3,368,924	35,776	94.1
Idaho.....	3,063,271	96,871	31.6
Kansas.....	2,876,124	515,156	5.5
South Dakota.....	2,813,511	183,979	15.2
Nebraska.....	2,637,155	373,868	7
North Dakota.....	2,531,200	183,336	13.8
Washington.....	2,448,675	293,478	8.3
Oklahoma.....	1,276,204	566,323	2.2

Average grant per capita on school population, excluding Oklahoma, 48.2.
Per capita grant to school children in Oklahoma, 2.2.

Nevada leads the list of States with 247 acres for each person of school age in the State in 1910. Oklahoma is at the bottom of the list with only 2.2 acres to each person of school age in the State in 1910. Wyoming follows Nevada with 94.1 acres for every child of school age. Arizona has 71 acres per capita for her children of school age. Montana has 54.4 acres for every one of her school children. Utah comes next with 49.6 acres to each school child. New Mexico has a per capita acreage for every one of her school children of 40.8 acres. Idaho has for each school child in the State 31.6 acres. For every school child Oregon has 19.3 acres; Colorado, 17.2 acres; South Dakota, 15.2 acres; North Dakota, 13.8 acres; Washington, 8.3 acres; Nebraska, 7 acres; and Kansas, 5.5 acres.

The average grant per capita to the 15 States in this list, excluding Oklahoma, based upon the school population, is 48.2. The average per capita grant to these 15 States, based upon the school population in 1910, was 24 times the per capita grant to Oklahoma.

\$5,000,000 LESS THAN ONE-THIRD VALUE OF LANDS.

The \$5,000,000 in cash granted the State of Oklahoma in lieu of sections 16 and 36 in the Indian Territory was not more than one-third the value of these lands.

What were these lands worth? What gives value to land? Soil, climate, season, transportation facilities, markets, society, schools, and churches.

These lands were located in an excellent climate. The soil was rich, fertile, and productive. The seasons were favorable, the normal rainfall was ample.

These lands were not in an unpopulated country remote from society, civilization, commerce, trade, and business. Six hundred and eighteen thousand one hundred and fifteen people were already in the Territory. Twelve of the States in 1910 had a less number of inhabitants. The two Territories in 1907 had a population of nearly 1,500,000 people.

Railroads were already built, markets were accessible, the cost of transportation reasonable. Flourishing towns and villages dotted the land. There were many thriving cities with populations ranging from one to fifteen thousand.

School privileges were very inadequate in the country, but the towns and cities had established creditable public schools; other institutions of learning had been founded; churches had been built; charitable and fraternal orders had been organized; and already the people had laid well the foundation for the highest type of society and civilization.

Great material progress had been made. Agriculture, mining, manufacturing, trade, transportation, and commerce were flourishing.

The Territory was surrounded by great, populous, wealthy States that had attained a high degree of development. On the south was Texas, on the east Arkansas, on the north Kansas, and on the west the best developed part of Oklahoma Territory, when lands were selling on the market at from \$20 to \$50 per acre.

The Territory was rich in minerals. Nowhere was there a better prospect for industrial development, for growth in its towns and cities, for increase in population, and wealth, and for rapid rise in the value of lands.

Who will say that these fertile lands thus situated and surrounded—located in the very heart of civilization, with markets, transportation, industry, population, schools, and churches—were worth only \$4.62 per acre?

The assessor of Oklahoma in 1909 placed a value on these lands. They assessed Oklahoma lands for taxation in 1909 at \$12.38 per acre. This meant that in their judgment these lands were worth from \$18 to \$25 per acre.

The United States through its Census Bureau valued the lands in Oklahoma at \$22.49 per acre.

In 1889 and 1890 Congress placed an estimate upon the school lands in a number of the Western States. The enabling acts admitting North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, in 1889, and Idaho and Wyoming, in 1890, granted these States sections 16 and 36. In this act Congress placed a limitation on the grant, prohibiting these States from selling any of these lands, even the poorest section, at less than \$10 per acre. This was equivalent to saying to the people of these States, "The poorest of these lands are worth to you \$10 per acre, and Congress, for the protection of the taxpayers and school children of the State, prohibits you from selling any of your lands at less than their value, and \$10 per acre shall be the minimum price at which any of these lands shall be sold."

But, lo, and behold! When Congress a few years later came to compensate Oklahoma for school lands which the Nation had appropriated for another purpose—a national purpose—Congress said to the people of Oklahoma, "Your lands are worth only \$4.62 per acre."

If it were unwise for the people of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Washington, Idaho, and Wyoming to sell their school lands for less than \$10 per acre as the minimum price, certainly the people of Oklahoma ought not to accept \$4.62 per acre for her school lands without a protest and without an appeal to the National Congress for justice in a matter that vitally affects her people.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not think, as a matter of fact, that the school lands in the States he refers to are actually worth anything like \$10 an acre, does he?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Well, I am only stating what the judgment of Congress was as to the value of those lands.

Mr. HELGESEN. Let me tell the gentleman that in North Dakota they are worth vastly more than \$10 an acre, and they have sold for more.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am glad to have the testimony of the gentleman from North Dakota as to the value of school lands in that State.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. But the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] is talking about the value at the time of the grant. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman says that the United States Census Bureau estimated the value of lands in Oklahoma at the time Oklahoma came into the Union at something over \$22 an acre.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. No; I said in 1910.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Well, in 1910. Can the gentleman state what was the value of the land in some of the other States that he has mentioned at the time they were admitted; for instance, Nevada, Wyoming, and Montana?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I did not look this up. I do not suppose the land in those States on the average is worth as much as land in some other States.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Do you not think that at the time they were admitted \$4.60 an acre would have been a pretty good price?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am candid in answering this question in the negative. These Oklahoma lands at that time could have been sold wholesale to a syndicate or corporation for \$15 an acre. Why, Mr. Chairman, not only was the surface of these lands worth that, but it was known that these lands were

rich in mineral. It was known that the new State would develop rapidly.

PER CENT ON PROCEEDS OF SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS.

The second bill which I have introduced and to which I desire to call the attention of the House is H. R. 28609. This bill carries an appropriation of \$500,000, or so much as may be necessary. This bill authorizes the payment to the State of Oklahoma of an amount of money equal to 5 per cent of the proceeds of the sale of public lands lying within what was formerly Oklahoma Territory on sales made between April 22, 1889, the date the first lands were opened to entry, and November 16, 1907, the date Oklahoma became a State in the Union.

The object of this bill is to equalize the amount received by the State of Oklahoma from a percentage on the proceeds of the sale of public lands with an amount received by 28 of the States of the Union under a similar provision.

OKLAHOMA'S GRANT INSIGNIFICANT.

The amount received by Oklahoma from the grant of 5 per cent on the net proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within the State is only one-eighth the average amount received by 28 other States under a similar grant.

I have prepared a table showing the States which have received this grant, the amount received by each State for the fiscal year 1912, and the total amount received by each State up to that time.

The table is as follows:

Amounts accrued and paid to States for purposes of education, or of making public roads and improvements, on account of grants of 2, 3, and 5 per cent of net proceeds of sales of public lands lying within said States.

State.	Total to June 30, 1911.	Fiscal year 1912.	Aggregate to June 30, 1912, inclusive.
Alabama.....	\$1,077,305.32	\$599.40	\$1,077,904.72
Arizona.....		1,652.99	1,652.99
Arkansas.....	323,897.84	1,013.16	324,911.00
California.....	1,062,698.44	17,354.82	1,080,053.26
Colorado.....	445,393.06	15,355.24	460,748.30
Florida.....	133,159.79	4,176.27	137,336.06
Idaho.....	231,342.61	10,541.35	241,883.96
Illinois.....	1,187,908.89		1,187,908.89
Indiana.....	1,040,255.26		1,040,255.26
Iowa.....	633,638.10		633,638.10
Kansas.....	1,122,353.55	3,116.86	1,125,469.41
Louisiana.....	467,862.06	325.83	468,187.89
Michigan.....	586,783.64	284.88	587,068.52
Minnesota.....	586,036.69	2,246.39	588,283.08
Mississippi.....	1,069,843.91	82.71	1,069,926.62
Missouri.....	1,059,760.74	669.87	1,060,430.61
Montana.....	366,647.00	37,598.88	404,245.88
Nebraska.....	551,388.13	8,006.32	559,394.45
Nevada.....	29,518.81	2,605.77	32,124.56
New Mexico.....	110,453.47	10,587.31	121,040.78
North Dakota.....	505,262.75	23,764.36	529,027.11
Ohio.....	999,353.01		999,353.01
Oklahoma.....	55,986.06	3,161.83	59,147.89
Oregon.....	701,687.81	15,328.30	717,016.11
South Dakota.....	263,485.30	44,582.90	308,068.20
Utah.....	75,860.78	5,834.00	81,694.78
Washington.....	390,903.57	6,026.78	396,930.35
Wisconsin.....	586,304.10	104.48	586,408.58
Wyoming.....	189,517.67	23,870.07	213,387.64
Total.....	15,854,577.66	238,889.77	16,093,467.43

Seven of these States, viz, Alabama, California, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Mississippi, and Missouri, have each received from this fund in excess of \$1,000,000. Ohio has received \$999,351.01. Oregon has received \$715,016.11. Wisconsin, North Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Iowa have received in excess of \$500,000. Montana and Louisiana have each received \$400,000. Washington, South Dakota, and Arkansas have each received over \$300,000.

In comparison with these large amounts received by the various States, ranging from \$300,000 to over \$1,000,000, Oklahoma has received the insignificant sum of \$59,147.89. This sum can never be materially increased, because the public lands in Oklahoma have been exhausted, final proofs have been made, and patents issued on practically all of our public lands. On the lands not yet patented there will be very few sales; the most of our settlers will acquire title under the three and five year law. Under this grant, as construed by the department, Oklahoma will never receive to exceed \$75,000.

Each of the 28 States have received under this grant an average of \$572,655. In round numbers, each of the States have received 10 times the amount received by Oklahoma. Many of the States in the list will receive under this grant large sums in the future, because large tracts of public lands in the State are still unentered.

The per capita grant received by the 14 public-land States that have been admitted since 1848, excluding Arizona, which

has just been admitted, based upon the population of 1910, is as follows: Wyoming, \$1.44; Oregon, \$1.06; Montana, \$1.06; North Dakota, 91 cents; Idaho, 74 cents; Kansas, 66 cents; South Dakota, 58 cents; Colorado, 57 cents; Nebraska, 47 cents; Nevada, 39 cents; New Mexico, 36 cents; Washington, 33 cents; Utah, 22 cents; and Oklahoma, 3 cents.

The largest amount per capita is \$1.44, received by the people of Wyoming. The smallest amount per capita was 3 cents, received by the people of Oklahoma.

The average amount received per capita by these 14 States, excluding Oklahoma, is 62 cents. In other words, the average amount per capita received by the people of these 13 States is 20 times the amount per capita received by the people of Oklahoma.

Taking these same 13 public-land States, which have been admitted since 1848, excluding Arizona, the amount received per capita, based upon the number of persons of school age according to the census of 1910, is as follows: Wyoming, \$5.96; Montana, \$4.31; Oregon, \$4.08; North Dakota, \$2.87; Idaho, \$2.49; Kansas, \$2.18; Colorado, \$2.16; Nevada, \$1.99; Nebraska, \$1.41; Washington, \$1.35; New Mexico, \$1.14; South Dakota, \$1.13; Utah, 67 cents; and Oklahoma, 10 cents.

The largest amount received by any State from the percentage on the proceeds of the sale of public lands was Wyoming, \$5.96. The smallest amount was received by Oklahoma, 10 cents per capita. The average per capita received by these 13 States was \$2.44.

In other words the average amount received by these States per capita is 24 times the amount received per capita by the people of Oklahoma from this grant.

The discrimination against Oklahoma in this grant is also seen in the amount received from each State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912. For that year South Dakota received \$44,582.90, Montana received \$37,598.88, Wyoming received \$23,870.07, North Dakota received \$23,564.36, California received \$17,354.82, Colorado received \$15,355.24, and Oregon received \$15,328.30, but Oklahoma received from this fund during that year only \$3,161.83.

The amount received by the State of Oklahoma compared with the total amount received, or the per capita amount, according to the population of 1910, or based upon the school population of the various States, is so insignificantly small as to make the grant to Oklahoma practically no grant at all.

What is the explanation of this? In the first place, Congress conveyed practically one-half of all the public lands in Oklahoma to the various Indian tribes of the Indian Territory. In theory the National Government received a consideration for these lands, but under the grant Oklahoma, of course, receives no percentage thereon. Secondly, before statehood the public lands lying within the State had been largely already patented. Thirdly, as a rule the settlers of Oklahoma did not purchase their land under the commutation act, but acquired title after a five years' residence.

The department has construed the provision in the Oklahoma enabling act providing for this grant to apply only to lands sold subsequent to statehood. The bill which I have introduced (H. R. 28669) grants to the State a sum equal to 5 per cent of the net proceeds on all sales from public lands from April 22, 1889, to November 16, 1907, the day Oklahoma became a State. In effect my bill grants to the State a sum equal to 5 per cent on the sale of public lands lying within the State sold either before or subsequent to statehood.

In all the 29 States receiving this grant the provision in the enabling act states specifically either that the per cent shall apply only to lands sold subsequent to statehood or a definite date is fixed on or about statehood from which the State should receive a percentage on the proceeds of all sales. The Nebraska enabling act is an exception, in this, that it grants the per cent of sales of public land both "prior and subsequent" to statehood. New Mexico was also granted this percentage on sales made while a Territory.

The Oklahoma enabling act is an exception to all the others. The language is indefinite and uncertain. It provides that there shall be paid to the State "an amount equal to 5 per cent of the proceeds of the sale of public lands lying within the State." The department has construed this language to limit the grant to sales of public lands made subsequent to statehood. The department, I think, is wrong in this construction. The grant was philanthropic in its nature, and should be construed liberally in favor of Oklahoma.

It may be suggested that Oklahoma is too late; that the people have slept on their rights. Not so. Congress itself has made a precedent for correcting a mistake or injustice relating to such a grant.

California was admitted into the Union by an act approved September 9, 1850. The act made no grant to the State of any percentage on the proceeds of the sale of its public lands. Fifty-six years passed away. Finally, by an act approved June 27, 1906 (34 Stat. L., 518), Congress granted to California 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the sales of public lands from date of statehood. Under this act California has received already \$1,080,053.26, and from the sales of land in 1912 received \$17,354.82.

Congress has been just and generous to California. I have faith that Congress will treat Oklahoma with the same degree of justice and generosity, and make an appropriation which will, in a measure at least, equalize the amount received by Oklahoma under this grant with the money that has been received by 28 States of this Union under a similar grant.

Mr. HELGESEN. How far back did it go in California?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. It went back to the time that it was admitted into the Union as a State.

Mr. HELGESEN. Five per cent on the lands from the beginning?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Went back to the sale of lands from the beginning—from the admission of the State in 1850.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the California proposition is very interesting. Will the gentleman explain to the House whether the California payment went through Congress as a separate measure, or was it on some appropriation bill?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. That California bill went through as a separate measure, considered by itself, which showed it had the due consideration of the House.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman state to the House what Oklahoma has done with its school lands in what was old Oklahoma Territory? I understand there is something about a million—

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Most of those lands have not been sold, but they are under lease.

Mr. MILLER. And still remain intact?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. They still remain intact. The common-school lands have not been sold.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. A portion of them have been sold and a portion have not been sold.

Mr. MILLER. Have arrangements been made to put them into a permanent fund?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

COMPENSATION FOR NONTAXABLE LANDS.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. The third bill which I have introduced, to which I wish to call the attention of the House at this time, is H. R. 28670.

The bill is entitled "A bill to pay the State of Oklahoma \$20,000,000 in lieu of taxes on lands and other property within the State, sold and disposed of by the United States under terms and conditions prohibiting the State from taxing the same."

The National Government, through treaty stipulations, has placed a large portion of the lands in Oklahoma in a position of being exempt from taxation. I have reached the conclusion that the State is entitled to compensation for loss of revenue occasioned thereby, and that no adequate compensation has been made. The object of this bill is to require the National Government to make such appropriation as will at least in a fair measure compensate the State and its various civil subdivisions for loss of taxes upon nontaxable Indian lands. The bill appropriates \$20,000,000, payable in 16 annual installments, to be distributed to the State, counties, and school districts, as their interests may appear, based upon loss of revenue.

OKLAHOMA BEARS NATIONAL BURDEN.

The United States in asking Oklahoma to provide nontaxable homes for more than one-third of the Indians of the United States is placing upon the 1,700,000 people of the State of Oklahoma a duty, an obligation, a responsibility, a burden, that belongs to all the 93,000,000 people of the United States.

Under the Constitution of the United States the Federal Government has no right, power, or authority, without the consent of the State and except upon such terms and conditions as shall be prescribed by the State, and except upon the payment to the State of such consideration as may be agreed to by the State, to exempt from taxation, for any period of time, any lands which have been sold or disposed of by the National Government.

Cooley, in his work on "Taxation" (third edition, p. 136), discussing the exemption of public lands from State taxation, says:

The disability remains effective until the United States shall have made sale or other disposition of the lands, but it then terminates, notwithstanding the title may not have passed by the actual execution and delivery of a patent.

In the Ohio enabling act Congress made three grants to the State—section 16 for schools, certain salt springs with contiguous land, and a per cent on net sales of public lands. Following these grants was this proviso:

Provided always, That three foregoing propositions herein offered are on the conditions that the convention of the said State shall provide, by an ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that every and each tract of land sold by Congress from and after the 30th day of June next shall be, and remain, exempt from any tax laid by order or under authority of the State, whether for State, county, township, or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years from and after the day of sale.

The Indiana enabling act, passed in 1816, made certain grants to the State on the express condition that the State would not tax lands which the United States had sold for a period of five years after date of sale. Four grants were made to Illinois on the express condition that the State would exempt from taxation lands sold by the United States for a period of five years, and exempt certain bounty lands granted to soldiers while the same should be held by the patentees or their heirs.

The enabling acts admitting Iowa, Alabama, Arkansas, and other States contain similar provisions.

Indeed, this proviso requiring the States to exempt from taxation, for a definite period of time, certain lands which the United States had sold or disposed of was inserted in all the enabling acts of those States in which there were lands which the United States desired should be exempt from taxation after statehood.

The grant to the States of 5 per cent on the sales of public lands apparently was intended as a special consideration to the States and the civil subdivisions thereof for loss of revenue on lands which had been disposed of by the United States and which the National Government desired should be exempt from taxation. In admitting Oklahoma Congress apparently gave no consideration to the question of compensating the State for exempting from taxation lands which the Government had conveyed to the Indians. Certainly there is nothing in the enabling act specifically referring thereto. There is nothing in the enabling act—no grant, gratuity, gift, or donation to the State—that may fairly be construed as a consideration to the people of the State for loss of revenue from lands no longer the property of the United States, but which had been made exempt from taxation by stipulations in treaties made by the Federal Government with the Indians.

In other words, the Federal Government has never claimed the right to exempt from State taxation property which it had disposed of.

The Federal Government has always conceded the right of the State to demand a consideration for exempting from taxation any lands or other property sold or disposed of by the United States.

The State therefore has the right to demand a full consideration for exempting from taxation property which has been made nontaxable by law, treaty, or other act of the United States.

I frankly admit the people of Oklahoma in their constitution have by express terms exempted from taxation "such property as may be exempt by reasons of treaty stipulations existing between the Indians and the United States Government or by Federal laws during the force and effect of such treaties or Federal laws."

This provision is mere surplusage. Without such a provision in the State constitution the State of Oklahoma could not have taxed the lands which were exempt from taxation by reason of treaties made between the Indians and the United States. The people of Oklahoma might any day repeal this provision in their constitution. Still the State could not tax these Indian lands. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that these lands were exempt from taxation and alienation by virtue of treaty stipulations, and that Congress itself was powerless by any statute to subject the property to taxation.

There is no specific provision in the enabling act requiring the people of Oklahoma to waive the right to tax lands belonging to the Indians. There is not a word in the enabling act expressing any special consideration to the people of Oklahoma for waiver of power to tax Indian property. The enabling act contains nothing which may be regarded as a consideration or compensation to the State for loss of revenue from nontaxable Indian property.

The State of Oklahoma received only such grants and gratuities as had been given to all the public-land States. Indeed, I have shown that, on the whole, the grants to Oklahoma, all things considered, have not been commensurate with grants to other States.

Yet Oklahoma is the only State where Indian property exempt from taxation is a matter which to any great degree seriously embarrasses the State and local governments.

It is clear, therefore, that the people of Oklahoma have received no consideration for exempting Indian property from taxation, and that the United States has not compensated the people of Oklahoma for loss in revenue by reason of such exempt property.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 14 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make the suggestion that at the time Oklahoma was admitted into the Union the Curtis Act of April 26, 1906, which provided that all lands from which restrictions were removed should become taxable, had been passed 18 months. Since that time we have had the decision in the case of Choate versus Trapp and others, which takes us back to the old agreement of 1902 and provides that some of the lands shall not be taxable until they are transferred and others nontaxable in perpetuity. So at the time we voted on our constitution the validity of the Curtis Act had not been questioned, and we very naturally expected we would have sufficient taxable values for the necessary governmental expenses.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman state how much the taxes are that are levied now in the State of Oklahoma—what they aggregate?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. The total amount?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Well, it is sufficient.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Are they as much as fifteen or sixteen millions of dollars?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I could not say exactly now; but I am not referring simply to State taxes—to expense of running the State—I am referring to State, county, township, and school districts; to losses sustained by all these governments.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. This is one fourth of the land, and if that would produce \$4,000,000 in taxation they must have a large tax down there and a large amount of revenue.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am simply giving you a fair estimate of the value of property that is exempt from taxation. Certainly one-third of all our lands are exempt from taxation. One-fourth of all our property is exempt from taxation. I have not the information as to the total amount expended annually by all our governments—State, county, township, and school district—but the State tax is not large compared with the total amount of taxes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. For a question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma believe that in good conscience the Government of the United States or the State of Oklahoma should tax Indian lands in the State of Oklahoma?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I do not. I believe it is the duty of the National Government, it is the duty of the people of this great Nation, to provide that the uneducated, the incompetent, the uncivilized Indian shall have his land and his home free from taxation as long as that condition exists; but, Mr. Chairman, whose duty is it to provide these untaxable homes for the wards of the Nation? Where does the obligation lie; who is responsible for the care and protection, the education and enlightenment of these wards of the Nation? Not Kansas, not New York, not Oklahoma, not any other State. That is a duty, a responsibility, an obligation, a burden which rests upon the United States of America—upon the 93,000,000 people of the United States and not upon the 1,600,000 people of Oklahoma, or upon the people of any other State.

Mr. CAMPBELL. May I ask, Did not these 1,600,000 people go into the State of Oklahoma knowing that they were encroaching upon the last home of the American Indian?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Ah, Mr. Chairman, the people of Oklahoma went into that State just like we come to Congress, just like men go to other States. They went there at the invitation of the United States, and the United States had the power and authority to have kept every white man out of that country. We are there to-day as citizens of the United States and as citizens of the State of Oklahoma. We have our own problems to solve, our own burdens to bear. We cheerfully bear our full share of national responsibilities. But we shall not without protest and without appeal for relief bear alone a

burden that belongs to the Nation. Mr. Chairman, just yesterday we passed a bill through this House appropriating \$7,000,000 for the support of the District of Columbia. Why do we appropriate that large sum—why do we bear half the expense of running the government here for 350,000 people of the city of Washington? One great reason is because here in the National Capital the United States Government has a large amount of property that is exempt from taxation. If we may pay \$7,000,000 a year in compensation to these 350,000 people in Washington, D. C., for the exemption of the United States property from taxation, why should not the people of Oklahoma be compensated for loss of revenue occasioned by the exemption from taxation of \$300,000,000 worth of property that belong to the Indians, who are the children of the Nation?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I do not know whether I fully understood the gentleman, but as I understand him, his statement is that one-fourth of the taxable land in Oklahoma is non-taxable. I am anxious to get this before the House with its full force, and the gentleman, as usual, states things conservatively. Is it not a fact that in the east end of the State, in what is known as the Five Civilized Tribes country, at the time of statehood a section of country as large as the State of Indiana had not one foot of taxable land outside of the cities?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. That is true.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not also true the Government has removed the restrictions from a great many of these Indians, made them citizens, and made it possible for them to impose burdens upon the white people that they themselves do not share?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. The Indians are citizens—may vote and exercise all the privileges of citizenship in our State, and nobody in Oklahoma objects to that.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is discussing a very interesting subject, and I want to say that I am in full accord with his proposition as to the obligation of the Government toward some of the States where very large Indian tracts are not taxable; and I would like for the gentleman, if he can, to suggest any remedy that is practicable at this time. In other words, we have a condition confronting us; but is it not too late in those States that are in the position of Oklahoma to receive what perhaps they ought to have had originally?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it is never too late to do right; it is never too late to do justice. Why should South Dakota and Montana and Arizona and New Mexico and the other Northwestern States which have large amounts of Indian property exempt from taxation bear an undue share of the burden which comes from providing incompetent Indians with homes free from taxation?

AMOUNT OF PROPERTY EXEMPT FROM TAXATION.

Few people realize the enormous value of Indian property in Oklahoma which is exempt from taxation, and it is almost impossible to comprehend the immense loss in revenue thereby occasioned to the State, county, township, and school district governments.

I present a table showing Indian population. The table is as follows:

Table showing Indian population of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, June 30, 1911.

Grand total	322,715
Five Civilized Tribes, including freemen and intermarried whites	101,287
By blood	75,360
By intermarriage	2,582
Freedmen	23,345
Exclusive of Five Civilized Tribes	221,428

BY STATES AND TERRITORIES.

Alabama	909
Arizona	39,216
Arkansas	460
California	16,371
Colorado	841
Connecticut	152
Delaware	5
District of Columbia	68
Florida	446
Georgia	95
Idaho	3,791
Illinois	188
Indiana	279
Iowa	369
Kansas	1,309
Kentucky	234
Louisiana	780
Maine	892
Maryland	55
Massachusetts	688
Michigan	7,519
Minnesota	10,711
Mississippi	1,253

Missouri	313
Montana	10,814
Nebraska	3,809
Nevada	5,240
New Hampshire	34
New Jersey	168
New Mexico	21,121
New York	6,046
North Carolina	7,851
North Dakota	8,253
Ohio	127
Oklahoma (includes 23,345 freedmen and 2,582 intermarried whites)	117,247
Oregon	6,403
Rhode Island	284
South Carolina	331
South Dakota	20,352
Tennessee	216
Texas	702
Utah	3,123
Vermont	26
Virginia	530
Washington	10,997
West Virginia	36
Wisconsin	10,360
Wyoming	1,601

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

Full bloods	26,686
Mixed blood, over one-half Indian blood	10,298
Mixed blood, but less than one-half Indian blood	64,255

There are in the United States 322,715 Indians; 117,247 of this number are in Oklahoma. We have within our State over one-third of the entire Indian population of the United States; 101,287 of this number belong to the Five Civilized Tribes; 15,900 belong to other tribes. The latter are Indians located in the western half of the State in what was formerly Oklahoma Territory.

Twenty-seven of the States have less than 1,000 Indians; 21 have less than 500 Indians; 7 of the States have less than 100 Indians. The total Indian population of 41 States of the Union is less than the Indian population of Oklahoma. In the amount of its Indian population Oklahoma stands absolutely in a class by itself.

I present table showing distribution of Indian property in the various States. The table is as follows:

Table showing value of Indian property, both private and individual, June 30, 1911.

Oklahoma, Five Civilized Tribes, \$191,946,070.34; other tribes, \$75,657,040.73	\$267,603,111.07
Arizona	36,915,162.10
California	41,921,654.53
Colorado	1,963,800.28
Florida	13,788.00
Idaho	14,573,008.60
Iowa	686,607.95
Kansas	4,252,008.55
Michigan	211,709.66
Minnesota	32,167,618.42
Montana	64,193,008.59
Nebraska	10,245,043.92
Nevada	1,264,426.58
New Mexico	16,916,560.69
New York	185,271.20
North Carolina	629,161.42
North Dakota	22,746,539.49
Oregon	36,645,098.06
Pennsylvania	30,172.22
South Dakota	41,015,702.05
Utah	3,055,275.84
Washington	52,086,258.37
Wisconsin	26,930,516.31
Wyoming	2,212,148.68

Grand total 678,564,253.08

In what was formerly the Indian Territory the allotted and unallotted Indian lands comprise 19,134,214 acres. About three-fourths of this vast area is untaxable for a long period of years. In what was formerly Oklahoma Territory there are 3,602,250 acres of untaxable Indian lands. In the entire State about 18,000,000 acres of Indian lands are not taxable. At \$15 per acre these lands are worth \$270,000,000. This vast estate, made untaxable by laws and treaties of the United States, is equal to about one-fourth of all the taxable property of the State of Oklahoma.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has made an estimate of the value of all the Indian property in the United States. According to this estimate the Indian property in the United States amounts to \$678,564,253. The Indian Bureau values the Indian property in the State of Oklahoma at \$267,603,111. Two-fifths of all the Indian property of the United States is in Oklahoma. All the Indian property in 41 States of the Union does not equal the amount of Indian property in the one State of Oklahoma.

If this property were taxed for State, county, township, and school-district purposes at 1½ per cent, it would bring to the State and its various civil subdivisions annually over \$4,000,000. At this rate, in the five years which have elapsed since statehood the people have lost in revenue from nontaxable Indian property more than \$20,000,000. Congress granted to the peo-

ple of the State \$5,000,000 cash in lieu of public-school lands in the Indian Territory. At 5 per cent annual interest this would bring the State an annual revenue of \$250,000. In the meantime the State and its various civil municipalities loses annually \$4,000,000 in revenue. They are losing \$16 in revenue from nontaxable Indian lands for every dollar in interest they receive from the \$5,000,000 cash appropriation. This must go on until the lands may be taxed. The loss which the people of Oklahoma will sustain by reason of nontaxable Indian lands cannot, of course, be accurately measured, but the loss will be enormous. In my judgment, when a final accounting is had in the matter of nontaxable Indian lands the people of the State will have lost in revenue above \$50,000,000.

We all agree that the lands of the incompetent, uneducated, and uncivilized Indians should be exempted from taxation, but some one must pay for this exemption. To relieve one piece of property from taxation is equivalent to increasing the tax upon all other property. To exempt Indian lands from taxation adds additional taxes to all other lands. Revenue lost from exempted Indian property must be made up by revenue from other property. There is no escape from these conclusions, unless the people submit to an inefficient government and inadequate educational facilities.

This 276,000,000 acres of property in Oklahoma that is exempt from taxation belongs to the Indians. The Indians are wards of the Federal Government—they are the children of the Nation. The care of Indians is a national duty. To provide them with nontaxable property is an obligation that rests upon the National Government. It is the business of the Nation to provide the Indians with nontaxable property. The cost of providing this nontaxable property is a debt the Nation owes and a debt the Nation should pay. The cost of exempting the Indian from any of the ordinary duties, obligations, and responsibilities of citizenship in the State in which he lives should be paid by all the 93,000,000 people of the United States. It is unjust, it is unfair, it is inequitable, it is indefensible for the people of this great Nation to ask the people of one State to bear an undue and an extraordinary proportion of a burden that in justice belongs to all the people of the Union.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

[Mr. HAYDEN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CLARK of Florida having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ALLEN].

[Mr. ALLEN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to another gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the consideration of this bill, I think it appropriate to discuss the question of farm credits and the important relation which that topic bears not alone to the interests of the farmers of this country, but to the food supply of the whole people.

Before the next Congress shall have expired there will be brought before it not only the matter of education for our agriculturists, but a consideration of the means of doing things which they know how to do.

The project of bettering the farmer's facilities for borrowing money in Europe has almost wholly been carried on by educating the farmer to help himself. The farmers have been taught to help themselves there by combinations of scattered, small units of the citizens, who organize small banks. A sort of investigation at the present time has been started in several different directions—a partial review of which was contained in the President's message upon that subject—for the purpose of ascertaining how they borrow money and what rate they pay in Europe. I anticipate that the next move may be an attempt to adapt European conditions to American conditions. I warn gentlemen of this House that it will be wholly impracticable. The plan must take other forms.

Attempting to work out this problem, I have introduced a bill which proposes to utilize the credit of the United States Government, without cost to it, and thereby materially lessen the interest burden now carried by the American farmer, and

make it possible for him to borrow for legitimate needs at lower rates.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. I will.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish the gentleman would give the House the number of his bill. I should like to examine it.

Mr. BATHRICK. The number of my bill is H. R. 27661.

In most foreign countries farm-credit systems did not become an established factor in agriculture until the governments had assisted by advancing funds for the purpose of establishing farm-credit organizations. Various associations had been organized for many years, but nearly all of them had gone by the way and were lost sight of and had done very little good to the agriculture of France.

The profit from farm products received by the farmer can not stand 6 or 8 per cent interest on his debts. That is the reason why so large a proportion of the farms are mortgaged to-day and will remain mortgaged in the future unless something is done to change this condition.

Mr. Herbert Williams, in a statement before the Senate Finance Committee in 1910, made it plain that our farm population sold each year less than \$300 per capita of farm products. A business of this character will not attract, but rather will repel investors, if money cost is too high. No business man will borrow money at a rate in excess of the net profit that he is getting in his business. If he does, he will stay in debt.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Does the gentleman remember that about 20 years ago this same matter was before the American people?

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes; it has been before the American people periodically a good many times, but nothing has been done.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I want to say to the gentleman that I am in entire sympathy, and hope to furnish him with a resolution which I introduced in the farmers' congress on the same line about 20 years ago, and I am going to vote for his bill when it comes up.

Mr. BATHRICK. I thank the gentleman; and many others will do the same, I think.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman to say that a man in business would not borrow money at a rate in excess of the average net profit of his business.

Mr. BATHRICK. Not in excess of the profit on goods he expected to move by borrowing.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman mean to say that a man that does not make any money never borrows money?

Mr. BATHRICK. Oh, yes; a man sometimes borrows money to get himself out of a hole that he got into by borrowing.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know of any way to force loans to the farmer?

Mr. BATHRICK. No. I know none of the loan sharks of the West will loan the farmer at a less rate of interest than 8 per cent, and you can not make them do it except by offering a lower rate elsewhere.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not speaking of the loan sharks of the West, but anybody.

Mr. BATHRICK. This is not a question of forcing anyone to lend; it is a question of relieving the farmers of this excessive burden which in the last analysis must be borne by the people who consume the food.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to say to the gentleman that I know farmers who are loaning money to business men at a rate of interest of 6 per cent.

Mr. BATHRICK. I am glad to hear this, but I am not talking about the farmers who have got out from under and are lending money. I am referring to the farmer who is obliged to borrow money, and prosperous farmers who know the road through debt on a farm will have sympathy for this movement. Besides, even the farmer who is now out of debt may desire to borrow money. No doubt many of them would do so and increase their acreage or otherwise better their facilities for producing crops if the interest rate were lower.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. I will.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like the gentleman to tell us the rate of interest paid by the farmers of Ohio on money that they borrow secured by mortgage.

Mr. BATHRICK. About 6 per cent; but there are schemers who seek to get more than the usual or fair rate everywhere. Even in this House some of our poorer Members are obliged to borrow money on the security of our salaries, and we pay nearly 8 per cent for it. I will say, however, that this seems to be no fault of the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. Certainly.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, the question that I desire to ask would perhaps be more apropos had it been put at the time the gentleman was reciting the details. I would like to add to the gentleman's suggestion that the farmer sometimes is asked to pay graft to certain directors of the bank, is he not, in order to pay a bonus on the loan?

Mr. BATHRICK. I suppose there are such cases. I do not think that is the rule, however. I believe the bankers of this country are on the average very honest and public-spirited people, and they are doing their banking business in a legitimate way. But that is not the subject. The subject is to do something to give the farmer better financial connection and lower his interest rate.

Mr. LAMB. The Farmers' Cooperative Bank is the principle of the thing, is it not?

Mr. BATHRICK. Oh, I beg to partially differ with the gentleman. I do not in any sense oppose any cooperative system among the farmers for the purpose of securing credit for themselves. My bill refers particularly to the question of lending money upon mortgages and the farm-land mortgage interest burden of the country. It does not refer specifically to the small loans, although I can see in the future relief in that direction by such a measure. If the farmers of this country should choose to organize somewhat in the manner of those in Europe, I believe it will be a good thing for them, but the system of lending money by cooperative banking societies in Europe does not particularly include the question of taking care of the farm-mortgage indebtedness in the United States. The trouble with the European cooperative system—it is too slow. We will all be dead before we get any relief. I do not want to wait until people die before doing anything to relieve them.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Ohio believe that the loans that are so much needed by the farmer, as well as by other classes of people in business, would be facilitated if the national banking and currency law was so amended as to allow the national banks to make loans on real estate?

Mr. BATHRICK. I think they would, but I do not know how a national bank could safely lend money on real estate. The national bank takes deposits that are subject to demand at any time, and I do not see how such a bank can safely take over any great amount of land mortgages, because they are not sufficiently liquid to provide for withdrawals. Besides, this plan would not reduce the rate.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, could not the difficulty to which the gentleman refers be overcome by having the mortgage which is to secure the loan to the national bank issued in another form and underwritten by the bank, as a coupon bond, thereby constituting liquid security, which would be a liquid asset of the national bank?

Mr. BATHRICK. That is about the way it is done by the Crédit Foncier, of France. The Crédit Foncier issues a bond, or, more properly, a debenture. Those debentures have received a large sale, but I think mainly because they have a lottery feature connected with them that gives a premium to people who happen to draw the lucky debenture. You can not ingraft on the American system any lottery plan, and unless you do that I fear these debentures would be so far below par that people would not buy them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask to continue my statement without interruption.

I am pleased to note that the Agricultural bill carries so liberal an amount of the people's money for the purpose mainly of investigation and education looking to improvement in farm production. The farms of this country are really the store-houses of the people's food supply, and food is the last-ditch necessity. It has been the history of all nations that in times of peace and in the struggles of war the strongest support for prosperity and success is the prosperity of agriculture. I sometimes think that the people in the city are not fully alive to these facts. The population in this country has gone on increasing year after year until consumption is rapidly outrunning production of food. Statistics indicate the falling off of the exportation of these products, and, while it may be as far distant as two generations before production falls below con-

sumption and we are obliged to import part of our food, I deem it good statesmanship that we take up this question pertaining to the improvement of agriculture and its relation to the necessities of the whole people and forestall any possibility of the direful results of a short food supply. We have been annually expending large sums to teach the farmer how to produce more and produce better, but we must now show him how to get the money to do it with.

Germany took up the question of helping the farmer to procure money with which to produce his crops at a time when famine stared that country in the face. We will not wait for any such exigency, but will confer upon our posterity, at least, and possibly upon ourselves living in this generation, the great good of supplying the last link to the chain of assistance to agriculture which we have so long been welding. In other words, knowing that farming is a business proposition and that business propositions can not be conducted without money, we will attempt to bring the farmer, now removed from financial facilities, into contact with means of a more ready procurement of loans. Minus these facilities the farmers of this country have been burdened with an enormous interest rate which has been a clog upon their efforts and an obstacle to the development of our agricultural resources.

The average rate of cost for farm loans in this country, as near as it can be ascertained, has been placed by careful investigators at about 8½ per cent. I use the word "cost" as distinguished from interest inasmuch as fees, bonuses, and other expenses have in the newer States to a great degree and in the older States to a smaller degree, but nevertheless surely, contributed to the cost of hiring money. It is estimated that the total interest burden upon farm debts is annually about \$510,000,000. At the December price in 1911 the entire wheat crop of this country was valued at a little over \$543,000,000, showing that it requires nearly the entire value of the wheat crop to pay our annual farm interest. The addition of this cost to the food consumed by all of us, whether we live in the city or country, is inevitable. Something can not be taken from nothing, and some one must pay. It can not therefore be considered class legislation if the Federal Government should do something to relieve this situation. We have expended large sums and taken long chances for the purpose of development in various directions. We have guaranteed railroad bonds, given away vast areas of land to encourage the building of transportation facilities, and done many other things which at first appearance seem for the benefit of private enterprise, but in effect reach out to enliven commerce, encourage competition, employ labor, and by this means benefit all the people.

It is a startling fact that farm interest, in the last generation, has consumed the total increase of all farm-land values. Every 12 years interest absorbs the value of all our farm buildings. Every 9 years it absorbs the value of all our live stock. Every 2½ years it absorbs the value of all our farm implements and machinery. Of all business enterprises the average profit upon agriculture is least compatible with a high rate of interest, and yet agriculture has been obliged to bear the heaviest rate of all.

The population of this country is but a few generations removed from foreign ancestry and many European customs and systems have therefore been naturally applied to our needs, and it is not surprising that in consideration of this subject we are liable to inquire into the method employed by European countries in coping with this question. Nonofficial and semi-official investigations have been made by societies, ambassadors, and individuals into the foreign plan. The information on this subject though quite extensive, is in many respects incomplete, but sufficient to suggest to us methods by which we may partly direct our efforts. We can not, however, expect to take European plans, formulated and operated upon the groundwork of a national and individual character very different from our own, and adapt them without change to our needs. How nearly we may go astray if we attempt this for this particular purpose is illustrated in our parcel-post law. There was no particular reason or warrant why we should limit the weight of our parcels to 11 pounds. The present Postmaster General has stated that he could as well operate it on a 60-pound basis. We simply took up the 11 pounds because Europe stipulated that weight.

This is the United States, and the Government belongs to all the people, and all the people certainly can do those things they want done for themselves. That, at least, is the theoretical assumption, and if we evolve some better plan than that employed by European countries there is no reason why we can not put it into force. There is no reason if the people know in which direction to start. In every movement of this kind there is always a confusion of ways and means, and the motive

of those who lead is often concealed, but I will trust the farmers of this country to quickly detect any intention of special interests to profit by any farm credit plan that may be offered.

Without entering into a concise history of the European cooperative agricultural banks or their land-mortgage banks it is worth noting that France first instituted cooperative credit in 1857. Austria and Hungary adopted it in 1851; Italy and Belgium in 1864; Russia in 1861; and these were founded, to a great degree, upon the original movement in 1848, and known, respectively, as the Schulz-Delitzsch and Raiffeisen systems of Germany. Thus it is quite apparent that the long tedious wait that elapsed before these systems reached their present, only partial, adoption, would scarcely be satisfactory to the more progressive spirit of the American people. Another illustration worth noting is that after an investigation of a committee which traveled throughout Europe, giving the matter their careful attention, Ireland adopted a cooperative plan in 1894. After about 15 years of operation the total amount loaned was only about \$275,000, which is about equivalent to a tear dropped in the ocean of our necessities.

Although Great Britain has been flooded with a propaganda of education, and she has been contiguous to the countries where this credit scheme had been developed, the result is still a charge of 6 per cent interest, and there are less than 100 of the societies in operation with a total outstanding loan of less than \$50,000.

In consideration of the new banking system which this House will take up shortly, it is worth while noting that one prominent writer states that nearly all the private banking companies of Europe use these cooperative credit societies as auxiliaries and handle a large portion of their funds. It should also be noted that the success so far attained in Europe seems to rest almost exclusively upon the willingness of all members of these credit societies to pledge their united liability for the loans to its members. In other words, if a man is a member of the credit society he must become surety for those who do borrow, even though he borrows nothing himself. It is evidently considered by all writers a fundamental necessity that the members of these cooperative credit societies pledge their combined resources for the debts of those who borrow.

I think it is palpable that the average American farmer has developed too much initiative and good business sense to make himself liable for other than his own debts. The European cooperative credit societies limit their membership to a small number, and these being each a surety for the other's obligation, institute a character of neighborhood espionage which would be entirely distasteful, and, I believe, impossible, to the average American farmer. Naturally, the farmer who was surety for his neighbor's debt watched his conduct.

It is not possible in my limited time to enter into all the details and reasons why the European method will not apply to America, but having pointed out a few facts why we need some kind of farm credit reform, I propose to briefly outline my own views as to a plan to bring it about.

As heretofore referred to, I have introduced a bill which, while not letter perfect and open to minor objections, perhaps, enunciates a principle which I believe to be entirely sound. This bill more nearly conforms, if the comparison is desired, with what is known in some other countries as the *Landschaften* or the *Crédit Foncier*. It is designed primarily to take care of a large portion of our \$6,040,000,000 farm debt, and would reduce the interest rate to not more than 4½ per cent. It contemplates the establishment of a bureau which I am pleased to call the farm-loan bureau, to be under the control and direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. The purpose of the bureau is to inquire into the value of farm land offered as security for the loans and the validity of title of the same. After the bureau shall have been satisfied upon these two items the Treasurer of the United States shall issue the amount of the loan to the applicant upon a receipt of the mortgage properly executed to him on behalf of the United States Government, but loans are not to be in excess of 60 per cent of the value of the property. The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to issue bonds of the United States bearing not in excess of 4½ per cent interest. The sum due upon the farm loans and payable upon the bonds shall bear as close a relation to each other as possible, that there may not be at any time a considerable balance upon one side or the other. Applicants and appraisers will be made subject to severe fine and imprisonment for fraud. Control of other detail of operation is to be left largely to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. This discretion is quite necessary, as it would be impossible to draw a bill that would anticipate all of the details.

Given the final day when the Government of the United States under this proposed measure had taken over all the farm-land

mortgages of the United States, and what would be the result? It is noted that the interest received from the farmers is not to exceed 4½ per cent and that the bonds sold are not to bear interest in excess of 4 per cent. I am quite confident that both of these maximum rates can be materially reduced and be entirely workable, but in any event there should be a margin of one-half of 1 per cent to the Government on these loans. The result would be a surplus, accumulated from the difference in the rate of interest which we pay on bonds and receive on mortgages, approximately of \$10,000,000 to \$25,000,000 per year in the hands of the farm-loan department. This would be utilized to cover possible losses, to pay operating expenses, or to reduce the taxes of the whole people. I can see no reason why an amortization plan could not be adopted and put in workable form as one of the details in the operation of this bill. The Government can borrow money on long time at a low rate of interest, and amortization tables could be worked out wherein the mortgagor, paying a small percentage of the debt above the interest rate, would be constantly reducing the principal, until at the end of his term he would be out of debt.

Regulations could be instituted covering cases whereby farm boys and farm tenants could be assisted in purchasing farms of their own. Farmers who now hesitate to borrow at the present rate of interest would see profit in enlarging their acreage and increasing their facilities for producing larger crops. A \$5,000 mortgage on a \$10,000 or \$12,000 farm, at the present average rate of interest, will in many cases consume nearly the entire profit. There is consequently little reason for the farmer boy to remain at home for the discouraging purpose of merely keeping even with the debt. Many commercial businesses are sufficiently profitable to carry the present rate of interest, but the average farm business can not carry it, with the result that the cry of "back to the farm" chokes in our throats at sight of this heart-eating interest rate.

Debt on the farm is a cloud blacker than night hovering over the farmer's rounded shoulders, and the "merry farmer's boy" stops whistling at sight of it and dreams of the city. Profit will keep the boy on the farm competing there instead of with overcrowded labor in town. A 1½ to 4 per cent difference on the annual farm interest debt will often make the difference between a satisfied farm boy and one going out the front gate with a valise, bound for town to stay.

A very large proportion of all our commerce in this country is conducted upon credit, but the cost of credit is normally regulated by the profit of commerce. Those few avocations of commerce which are not sufficiently profitable to use credit at a cost set by those which lead can only struggle on without this advantage. Agriculture has long been in this class, and, minus the greater margins of profit, it has thereby been oftener put to the necessity of borrowing, and the necessity of borrowing has made it a prey to all kinds of pound-of-flesh lenders. It may be possible that we can dispense with the weaker brethren of these lines of commerce which provide us with some necessities of life, but we can not dispense with the farm. The preservation of our food supply, looking ahead with only reasonable precaution, is all-sufficient excuse for legislation that can not help but be beneficial to the man in the city as well as the man on the farm.

This bill does not contemplate the entrance of the Government in the field of banking. It only contemplates on the part of the Government the guaranty of a farm mortgage. We have guaranteed railroad bonds and we are now lending money to the banks at 2½ per cent. Who can contend that guaranteeing a farm mortgage is less safe than guaranteeing a railroad bond? Who can contend that it is class legislation to lend money to the farmer upon security of the earth itself at 4½ per cent when we are now lending money at 2½ per cent on security of municipal or county bonds?

The bonds issued by the Government under this proposition would have behind them not only the taxing power of the people but they would have behind them also the individual property and value of the land upon which the bonds are, in effect, predicated. It would not be inflation, because it would be merely a transfer of a debt due one class of lenders to a debt due another class. France is the most prosperous nation on the earth to-day, and yet she has four times the national debt, in outstanding bonds, of the United States, notwithstanding that our resources are much greater than hers.

The function of lending money to farmers on land mortgages might be given under Government control to a private company, but why do that if the Government must control the private company? The control would be as surely the exercise of Government function in the matter as it would be for the Government to do the work itself, with the disadvantage of turning whatever profit there was in the business over to the individuals

of the private company instead of back into the pockets of the people through the National Treasury. No bureau could be established for the purpose of handling money that could be less open to possibilities of the malfeasance of public officials than this. Its operation could not be attended by any of the acts of official dishonesty which are brought out as arguments against Government ownership of public utilities and little technical knowledge would be required by the commissioners.

There are those who fear every move that appears in any way or sense an innovation. They cling tenaciously to ancient history and shudder at the making of new history. We are not bound to do all things as Europe does. We are a progressive Nation, and it is our purpose to do things better than Europe does. We have grown to a mighty Nation because of innovation and because of the development of new institutions, and if we can by Federal legislation cure the ills with which this subject deals in six months or a year, why wait for the dilatory results of the half century that has been required to partly cure them in the European way? [Applause.]

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Iowa to use the balance of his time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to indorse what my colleague [Mr. BATHRICK] has said in reference to the importance of legislation looking to the establishment of farm credit cooperative concerns, however much difference of opinion there may be as to the form of the legislation. There are few subjects that can engage the attention of the House that are of more importance to the country at large than that one, and he is to be commended for his zeal in going into that subject. However, Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself more especially to the bill under consideration. This bill carries some \$17,000,000, and I will say that there is no appropriation made by the House of Representatives which brings larger returns to the American people [applause] than the returns made by the appropriation passed for the Department of Agriculture. In that bill there is no item that will bring larger return than the item that relates to the farm-management work, of which I wish especially to speak. In the report of the committee on the last year's bill an appropriation of \$186,000 was provided for that bureau. It will be remembered that there was something of a contest in the House, and as a result of that contest the appropriation was increased to \$250,000. When that bill went to the Senate that appropriation was increased still more to the sum of \$300,000, and in that form the bill of last year finally passed. In the committee report of this year \$375,000 are allowed. That, however, is not the amount that is asked for by the department. As I understand, the head of the bureau, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, has asked for \$435,000; and to me it is a matter of regret that the committee did not feel justified in allowing even this enlarged appropriation, because I am sure that it is an appropriation that means much, not simply to the farmers of the country but to all the people of the country. As we come to ask an enlarged appropriation for the farm-management work, it is but proper that there be a sort of invoice to see what has been done and see what has been accomplished with the money we appropriated last year.

I invite attention to the fact, in the first place, that as a result of the increased appropriation made last year the work of the Farm Management Bureau has already been organized in 60 counties of the United States. That is to say, an expert from the Agricultural Department has been assigned to those counties, and the work is already organized and going on successfully. I have before me here a statement which I shall insert in the RECORD, showing the present status of the work.

The statement is as follows:

COUNTIES IN WHICH COUNTY AGENTS ARE EMPLOYED.

Colorado: Conejos, Costilla, Rio Grande, Saguache (one man); El Paso, Logan.
 Idaho: Bonner.
 Illinois: Kankakee.
 Indiana: Laporte, Montgomery.
 Iowa: Blackhawk, Clinton, Montgomery, Scott.
 Kansas: Leavenworth.
 Kentucky: Henderson.
 Michigan: Alpena, Montmorency, Presque Isle (one man); Iron, Kalamazoo, Kent.
 Minnesota: Bigstone, Grant, Otter Tail, Pope, Stevens, Swift, Traverse.
 Missouri: Cape Girardeau, Pettis.
 Nebraska: Gage, Merrick.
 New Jersey: Mercer, Sussex.
 New York: Broome, Chemung, Clinton, Herkimer, Jefferson, Oneida, Ohio, Portage.
 Oregon: Marion, Wallawa.
 Pennsylvania: Bedford, Blair, Butler, Mercer, Montgomery, Washington.

South Dakota: Brown.
 Vermont: Bennington, Windsor.
 Washington: Wahkiakum.
 West Virginia: Kanawha, Wood.
 Wisconsin: Barron, Eau Claire, Oneida, Price.
 Total number of counties in above list, 60.

COUNTIES WHERE THE BUREAU OF FARM MANAGEMENT HAS ALLOTTED FUNDS AND THAT ARE ABOUT READY TO EMPLOY A COUNTY AGENT.

Illinois: Champaign, Livingston, McHenry.
 Indiana: Parke, St. Joseph.
 Iowa: Clay, Muscatine, Polk.
 Kentucky: Warren.
 Maryland: Baltimore.
 Michigan: Allegan, Branch, Macomb, Saginaw.
 Missouri: Audrain, Buchanan, Marion.
 New York: Cortland, Franklin, Lawrence, Niagara.
 Vermont: Caledonia, Orange.
 Total number where the bureau has allotted funds, 23.

COUNTIES WHICH WILL PROBABLY HAVE LOCAL FUNDS RAISED SOON.

Illinois: Fulton, Knox, Peoria, Tazewell, Will.
 Indiana: Steuben.
 Iowa: Audubon, Cass, Cerro Gordo, Marion, Monona, Page, Pottawattamie, Wapello, Woodbury, Van Buren.
 Kansas: Harvey.
 Kentucky: Christian.
 Michigan: Berrien, Calhoun, Charlevoix, Genesee, Hillsdale, Jackson, Lapeer, Newaygo, St. Joseph, Shiawassee, Oakland.
 Missouri: St. Louis.
 New Hampshire: Coos, Merrimack.
 New York: Cayuga, Chautauque, Chenango, Erie, Lewis, Monroe, Onondaga, Orange, Rensselaer, Tompkins, Washington, Wyoming.
 Ohio: Columbiana, Greene, Knox, Highland, Washington.
 Pennsylvania: Bradford, Chester, Clearfield, Cumberland, Dauphin, Fayette, Lackawanna, Lancaster, Lawrence, Lycoming, Tioga, Warren.
 South Dakota: Edmunds, Spink.
 Vermont: Windham.
 Washington: Benton.
 Total number of counties in the foregoing list, 65.

Up to date there have been 186 inquiries from counties all over the country relative to this cooperative work, in addition to the lists shown above.

Mr. WILLIS. For example, in the State of Minnesota an expert, an "agricultural soil doctor," if I may so characterize him, has been assigned to seven counties in that State. In New York six men have been assigned to six counties and are at work in those counties. In Iowa they have been assigned to four counties, in Michigan to six, in Pennsylvania to six, Wisconsin four, Ohio one, and so on in the different States of the Union, making a total of 60 counties in which the work is now organized and being carried on successfully.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I will ask the gentleman if he is not mistaken in that it is 78 instead of 60 counties?

Mr. WILLIS. I got the figures from the Department of Agriculture a few days ago.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I got my information from the Secretary of Agriculture, and he gave me 78.

Mr. WILLIS. I said the Department of Agriculture gave me the figures only a few days ago, but very likely the gentleman is correct, and he suggests now that the organization has been perfected in 78 counties; if so, it simply enforces the point I am seeking to make, that under this appropriation the work is going on and is going on rapidly and successfully. At the time I had this statement prepared there were 23 counties in the United States in which the funds had already been allotted, and they were ready to commence, simply awaiting the assignment of men from the Agricultural Department. In the State of Illinois there were 3, Michigan there were 4, Iowa there were 3, New York 4, and so on through the various States, making a total of 23. Now, in addition to that, when this report was made out there were 65 additional counties, besides those I have already named, in which the people were organizing and raising their funds and in which they expected to be able to apply at a very early date for the assignment of men.

In the State of New York there were 12 counties; in Iowa, 10; in Ohio, 5; Pennsylvania, 12; Michigan, 11; and so on in the various States, making 65 in all. So that, counting those in which the work is already organized and those in which the funds have been allotted and those in which the funds are now in process of collection, there are 148 counties in the United States in which this work is well under way, and in addition to that there were some 186 others that were making their plans, making the total at the time this table was prepared of 334 counties in which the work had been organized or was in process of organization since the appropriation bill of last year passed.

I notice in the hearings, pages 28 and 30, that a very detailed account of the work is given by the head of the bureau, and at this time I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a certain part from the hearings and from the bulletin of the Ohio Experiment Station.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. At page 30 of the hearings, where the committee is making inquiry concerning the duties of county agents, the following statements occur:

Mr. LEVER. Just what does this man do?

Mr. SPILLMAN. Well, his work is so large and so diverse that I can not answer that in just a sentence. There are four general types of work for him to do. The first thing we instruct him to do is this: We realize that there are already farmers in that county who know more about farming on their farms than anybody else knows. We instruct him to hunt up all of those highly successful farmers and learn all they know. After a man has made a study of hundreds of farms in one county, if he is the right kind of man, he will know more about farming in that county than any one man, because he has gotten to know so many of them. We say, "We know there are lots of men in this county who know a great deal more than we know about certain phases of farming here, and we want to get that and make it public property—give it to the other farmer who does not know—and we are going about now to learn." Well, the farmers take that as a compliment to them, as it is intended and as it is deserved. Then, after a man has made a study of hundreds of the best farms in the county, he becomes a welcome visitor on any farm in that county, and we find the more advanced and progressive a farmer is the more eager he is to have these men visit his farm.

Mr. LEVER. Now, then, does he establish a series of farms in the shape of a circuit, which he visits from time to time?

Mr. SPILLMAN. In some cases he does that. We have, for instance, one man in Bedford County, Pa., who has been there for some time; you see, we have only started most of these men in this year, but that man we have had at work three years, and he has this year 1,700 farms growing some crop under his direction.

Mr. LEVER. How does he manage to visit those crops and see that they are growing according to his directions?

Mr. SPILLMAN. He has what the farmers of the county call a manure spreader, a little automobile; he gets over that county and he can visit about 20 men a day with that automobile, and sometimes, if they are close together, he can visit more than that, and frequently he will get 40 or 50 of them together at a schoolhouse and talk with all of them, and in one hour he will get the situation before these farmers.

Mr. CANDLEY. You say he has 1,700 demonstrations in one county?

Mr. SPILLMAN. Yes. The farmers call his automobile the manure spreader, and when we asked them why they called it that they said, because it had increased the yield of crops all over that county. Now, to show you the effect of this work, I will take that county where we have been at work the longest time. It is a county up in the mountains, where apple trees do very well. The farmers have had apple orchards there ever since they have been there, but they had never taken any special care of those orchards. They had never done any spraying; they knew nothing about pruning; and they knew nothing about packing, sorting, or marketing the apples; they would simply take everything off the trees they could get—good, bad, and indifferent—and put the apples in barrels and sell to the local buyers. Three years ago he interested a few men in pruning and spraying their orchards; that fall he got them to form a little organization, and built a packing shed alongside the railroad; he helped them grade their apples; and that fall those men shipped out three carloads of especially fine apples. They got a net price of 85 cents a bushel for them, while those who sold locally got from 25 cents to 50 cents. Now, the next year more farmers came into this organization, and they shipped 42 carloads of apples last year from that one county. The year before was the first time a carload had ever been shipped by the farmers, but for this year I have not had a report. I do not know how many carloads were shipped this year, but I am sure more than last year.

The farm-management work proper was first provided for in the appropriation bill of 1904. At the same time the Knapp work in the South was commenced. As a matter of fact, but little was done in the Northern States for many years outside of investigation. Dr. Spillman, of the Department of Agriculture, now at the head of the Farm Management Bureau, had charge of all the investigation. Dr. Knapp had charge of the cooperative demonstration work in the South. Large appropriations were made to exterminate the boll weevil, but it was found out that there was no way to head off the ravages of this insect, and, as a matter of fact, the appropriations which were made presumably to exterminate the boll weevil have been used very largely in teaching the poorer class of farmers in the South the elements of agriculture. They have been taught the benefits of diversification of industry, crop rotation, soil fertility, and so forth. I commend to the Members of the House the statement made by Dr. Knapp on page 41 of the hearings. The statement of Dr. Knapp is as follows:

Now, what we do with this money is to put county demonstration agents at work, who take up with the farmers the problem of how to produce cotton under boll-weevil conditions, and at the same time show them how they can grow their own meat, grow their own forage, and grow their own corn, and, as they say in the South, live at home. Where we strike a territory in the South, as you gentlemen from the South know, in which cotton has been raised for years and years under old conditions, it has been the custom of every renter, every tenant, and practically every farmer, even where he owned his own farm, to go to his merchant or to his banker and get his advance for the next year. The entire cotton crop was raised on credit. When the boll weevil came along the bankers lost faith in the ability of the people to produce cotton; they got frightened and withdrew credit from the farmers; the merchants withdrew credit, and they could not get credit from their bankers, or from the commission men in New Orleans, Atlanta, or other central places. And when credit goes down, as happened in Mississippi, labor, when it can not get an advance, simply gives up and leaves the country, and it comes back very slowly; in fact, a good deal of that labor will never come back to the territory it left, the result being abandoned houses, abandoned farms, fields lying idle, distress, and everything of that sort. Now, under those circumstances we must teach those people to grow their own stuff so they will not have to have that amount of credit, and that we can do if we have men teaching them how to raise corn, forage, peanuts, and other things.

By doing that work we save farms from being abandoned, because we put them on their feet and teach them how to farm successfully. And those who follow the directions of the Government in raising cotton continue to raise cotton year in and year out successfully, even with the boll weevil there.

For example, it is quite clear that as a result of the work of this single bureau, the corn crop of the sunny South has been increased almost 200,000,000 bushels in a single year. So it has come about that the Southland has come to be one of the great corn-producing sections of the country, in regions where, before this work was commenced, practically no corn was raised.

When this work commenced the farmers of the South were dependent almost entirely upon their single crop of cotton. They bought their meat, and their flour, and substantially everything they used. When the cotton crop failed they were completely broken financially. The object of the Knapp work has been to teach them the great advantage of the diversification of industry, and, as is well known, the work has been marvelously successful. All this time but comparatively little has been done in the North, as I undertook to show in my remarks when the agricultural appropriation bill of 1912 and the Lever extension bill were pending in the House. But in recent years a great impetus has been given to the farm-management work. The object of this work is to study the farm as a whole. It is not merely a scientific investigation of this crop or that crop, but the idea of the work is that a man shall go from the department directly to the farmer, study the farm as a unit, find out whether the farm is paying, and, if not, why not. The experts sent out by the department help the farmer in solving his practical problems. There is no bureau in the Government that is doing more for the betterment of the people than the Farm Management Bureau.

They are helping in the solution of the problem of the high cost of living. In my judgment the solution they are proposing, viz, greater and more economical production, is the only one possible. Their appropriation two years ago was \$150,000. As the result of the contest in the House and the liberality of the Senate the appropriation last year was increased to \$300,000. The work that is being accomplished with this money is wonderful. Sixty counties in the United States already have county men—that is to say, a man is assigned to the county. He is given \$1,200 by the department. The rest of his expenses, office rent, and so forth, are provided for by the county. In most cases the county furnishes this officer with a little runabout, so that he can reach all parts of the county readily. The idea is eventually to have a "soil doctor," or agricultural doctor, so called, in every county. This officer is sort of a councilor, who may be consulted by any farmer at will. Sixty counties already have the work fully organized and the men at their posts; 23 more counties have their arrangements all made and are awaiting the detail of the men; 250 more counties have made application for detail of men; so that it can be seen that the idea is spreading over the country like wildfire.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIS. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to an analysis of the work that is being undertaken in my own State of Ohio, and for this analysis I am very largely indebted to Experiment Station Bulletin No. 127, prepared by Mr. L. H. Goddard, of the Ohio Experiment Station. In a word, the plan of the work, as we are undertaking to carry it on in our State, is this: At the head of the organization is a State leader, who is responsible not only to the department, but also to the State. The State is cooperating in this work and is paying liberally for carrying it on. A statement appears in the hearings showing the amount contributed by each State, and I believe that the State of Ohio is contributing more, perhaps, than any State in the Union to this particular branch of the work. As is shown by the hearings (p. 35), the State of Ohio is contributing \$11,760 per annum to this important work. According to the table given in the hearings no other State in the Union is contributing so liberally.

Under the State law there are seven district supervisors, and then beneath those it is required that there shall be a county agent, a "soil doctor" or "agricultural doctor," for each county, assigned to that county and within the reach of the farmer. We have been collecting a vast amount of scientific information in the Agricultural Department, but the trouble has been to get that information to the actual farmer, so that he may solve his actual practical problems.

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the work of the Farm Management Bureau comes nearer to bringing this scientific

information right to the doors of the farmer, so that he can apply it practically to his own problems, than does any other agency of the Government. The prime purpose of the farm management, field studies, and demonstration work in Ohio is to bring to each farmer on his own farm, and interpret for his farm, the results of the years of experimental investigation that have been made by the experiment stations of the Department of Agriculture of this and other countries, and to combine these results of scientific investigations with the successful farm practices worked out by the best farmers of the country. In short, it is a plan to help combine the science of the farmer with practice on his own farm.

But it may be said, Why this concern and solicitude for the farmer? It may be said that because of the high cost of living, about which we hear so much, the farmer is already making immense profits.

But I want to invite attention to this fact, that although prices are good for the farmer's products—and they are a whole lot better than they will be when, under threatened tariff reduction, substantially everything that the farmer produces is put on the free list—yet even now, with the high rate of prices, the farmer is not making the profit that many people suppose he is making. A great portion of the high consumer's cost goes to pay the high cost of transportation and the high cost of distribution, so that in many instances the farmer gets only 20 or 30 or 40 per cent of the price actually paid for the article by the consumer.

I have before me a very interesting table that was prepared by the agricultural experiment station of the State of Ohio. An investigation was made to find out what the farmer was actually making as compared with the wages of hired men. It was found in the area investigated that the average wage of the hired man on the farm was \$360 a year. The experts said, "We wonder whether the men who are hiring these people are actually making more than the hired men are making. Is it more profitable to be a farmer or his hired man?"

Here is the result of the investigation: There were 5.4 per cent of the farmers that were making more than \$500 more than the hired man was making per year. There were 3.8 per cent who were making between \$400 and \$500 more than the hired man was making. There were also 3.8 per cent that were making between \$300 and \$400 more than the hired man was making. There were 4 per cent receiving from \$200 to \$300 more than the hired man was receiving. There were 8 per cent receiving from \$100 to \$200 in excess of what the hired man was making. There were 9 per cent who were receiving from \$1 to \$100 more than the hired man was making; and, note this, Mr. Chairman, there were 66 per cent of the farmers in that great section of my native State of Ohio that actually were making less than the hired man was making. So that the farmer is not making these immense profits which he is supposed to be making. Let us give him this increased appropriation. He deserves it and the welfare of the country demands it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to add certain statements from Bulletin 127 of the Ohio Experiment Station, by L. H. Goddard. The statements are as follows:

The following is the outline of a plan which has been adopted by the Ohio Experiment Station, department of cooperation, and the United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Farm Management of the Bureau of Plant Industry, for reorganizing the extension work which has previously been conducted by the former institution. In the execution of this plan there will be required:

1. A State leader to be employed jointly by the two institutions who, as the representative of both, will have charge of all their work of this character in the State.

2. Seven district supervisors to be employed in the same manner as the State leader, to be responsible directly to the State leader, each to have charge of the farm management field studies and demonstration work which may be conducted in an assigned district of from 10 to 15 counties.

3. County agents to be installed by the State leader at the request of the counties interested, to be under the direction of the supervisor of the district in which that county is situated, and to be supported jointly by the Ohio Experiment Station, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the people of that county, and possibly by other organizations interested in the work. These county agents are to have charge of the field studies and demonstration work which may be conducted in the county to which they have been assigned.

Township assistance will be afforded temporarily by each district supervisor in a single township of his district in which special interest is shown in demonstration work.

District supervisors and county agents should be men who have had training in our best agricultural colleges, who are therefore familiar with the advanced theories of agricultural production and who have also had practical experience on the farm as boys and for several years after leaving college.

When these county agents are placed in a community, it will be their duty first of all to study the local farming conditions. They must get acquainted with the farmers and learn what is being done in the way of crops grown, cultural practices, means taken to keep up the production of the farm, the usual enterprises of the farm, how these are organized into a farm system; in short, what the actual farm problems

of the community are, and then to cooperate with each farmer in helping him to place his cultural operations and farming system on a better paying basis. Such a man will not be able to reach conclusions nor revolutionize agriculture in a day, but if he is aggressive and farmers will make use of him in the same way they do a doctor or a lawyer he will prove of great helpfulness in any agricultural community.

But having this information, just how shall we take it to the farmer on his own farm? It would be highly desirable if a district supervisor could do this himself, but he can not investigate and demonstrate at the same time. We must keep a staff of investigators constantly at work if we wish our demonstrations to be of value. To be entirely frank, our experience in Ohio teaches us that the greatest danger which to-day confronts agricultural extension work in a progressive section is the inability of the extension workers to state to the individual farmer much of anything with definite assurance. While the scientist has developed a vast amount of valuable information, this must be adapted to individual farm conditions if it is to be of value to the farmer. If it is not so adapted, the demonstrator is just as apt to be discredited as is the doctor who prescribes medicine without having first diagnosed the condition of his patient.

While we believe firmly in the value of cooperative experiments, we also believe that these experiments will be very much more effective if their use is directed by a county agent who can give his attention constantly to a single county. Each experiment ought to be planned specially for the conditions existing on the farm on which it is to be made, and, if possible, its execution should be carefully supervised. Many farmers will doubtless be able to determine from the published reports of the district supervisors what is best for their farms, especially if the conditions are not too intricate, just as many of us go with freedom and assurance to our medicine shelf for relief from the minor ailments. But just as most of us reach the time, sooner or later, when we are willing to call in the doctor, most farmers will at times be glad to call in the county agent, who, in the light of his previous training, instruction by his district supervisor, and experience with similar cases, can speak with some assurance as to what should be done under existing conditions.

On the other hand, too much must not be expected of the county agent. It is necessary that we crawl before we walk and walk before we run. If we are to secure permanent results, it will be necessary to build slowly and securely and to avoid spectacular work. At first thought it might be supposed that a trained man could determine off hand just what it would be wise for the farmers of any section to do. On the contrary, however, we have observed that almost every farm has some conditions which are peculiar unto itself, and not the least of these peculiarities are the likes and dislikes of the manager, which manifestly are of paramount importance. Therefore the first step of the county agent is to make a study of the local conditions, just as a doctor should diagnose carefully his patient's trouble before prescribing medicine.

Thus far the only kind of extension work to which special reference has been made is that associated with farm practice, which considers only the selection and arrangement of the operations in connection with individual farm crops or farm enterprises to enable the production of maximum yields. While large yields are certainly very important, maximum yields and the most successful farming do not necessarily go hand in hand. The only basis on which the success of a farm can really be judged is that of net income from the whole farm, providing the productive capacity of the farm has not been impaired.

Farm management considers, among other things, what enterprises—crops, kind of livestock, etc.—shall be undertaken on any given farm, how they shall be arranged, and how in detail they shall be conducted in order to fit into this arrangement. The selection of each enterprise depends upon many things, such as adaptability of soil, climate, available labor, and possible market. It is useless to undertake to introduce enterprises on a farm which will not produce well under the conditions existing thereon, or for which there will not be sufficient available labor, or from which the products can not readily be marketed at satisfactory prices.

In the absence of a local condition which makes available transient labor of satisfactory quality at reasonable prices, it is necessary to try to select enterprises that will use the same amount of labor all the year round. In doing this it may be necessary to select two crops which conflict to a certain extent in their labor requirements, thus forcing the yield of one or both to be lowered materially for want of attention at the proper time. It may even be wise to grow a crop which produces little if any profit, merely to keep the labor employed continuously.

While these supervisors and agents can not be everywhere and do everything—indeed, if their work is to be fruitful they must give most of their attention to a few things at a time—yet with the proper spirit, which we shall hope to develop in each and every one of them, they can wield a wonderful influence toward making rural Ohio one of the best places in the world in which to live, and toward maintaining, or even improving, our present high standard of citizenship. Unless the signs of the times are misleading there are stranger things possible than that the rural teachers and the rural preachers, together with the leaders of many other rural organizations, will become very able lieutenants in connection with this great extension movement. Let us hope that the signs indicate truly, for 1 man to 3,000 farms, which would be the best that could be hoped for when an agent has been installed in every county of the State, would be but a drop in the bucket. He would have to visit 10 farms every day in order to get around once a year.

In conclusion, then, farm management field studies and demonstration work, as they are now being launched in Ohio, contemplate not only the improvement of the crop yields of the State but also the production of a greater net income for each farm of the State and the establishment on these farms of better homes, situated in better rural communities.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record—the remarks that I made this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HAWLEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] has kindly yielded three minutes of his time to me, and I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we live in the midst of revolution—revolution proposed and revolution threatened. It is true there are few open avowals of revolutionary intent; no armed forces hostile to our form of government and to our institutions thunder at our gates or threaten our liberties. On the contrary, the forces of revolution, though they have among their leaders many supremely selfish and inordinately ambitious and some thoroughly irresponsible and consciousnessless men, are in the main composed of entirely well-meaning people, who, carried away by their enthusiasm or by the claims and sophistries of others, fail utterly to realize that they are the advocates and supporters of a revolutionary cause.

Our forefathers came to these shores to escape persecution—social, religious, political. They came to get away from too much government. They fled from pestiferous interference with their local and personal affairs, by authorities with whom they had little influence and over whom they had no control, quite as much as from flagrant acts of tyranny and persecution. In fact, all history teaches us that the petty annoyances, indignities, and injustices inflicted by the irresponsible agents of a centralized government have in all times been more intolerable than the atrocious but generally infrequent persecution and tyranny of despots. Bureaucracy, the agent of centralization, has made more anarchists than all the overt acts of tyranny.

Our forefathers sought to establish a government under which the affairs and conditions of daily life, of men's association with each other, should be directly controlled locally by the people themselves. No doubt they realized that such a government must, in the nature of things, be at times less forceful and effective in certain respects than a government directed and exercised from a distance, and thus free from the faults which purely local interests sometimes develop in a locally governed community. No doubt they realized that there would be times when, under the stress of local excitement, the pressure of local interest, the temporary lapse of local virtue, the machinery of government, and of law enforcement would be temporarily enfeebled, palsied, or paralyzed; and yet realizing all these things, profiting by their own experience, by their intimate knowledge of the history of mankind, they deliberately chose a form of government in which most of the authority of the people was exercised locally.

Critically analyzed, some of the complaints of our forefathers of over-sea interference with local rights seem trivial, and in a sense they were, but they were of tremendous importance in the principles they involved. So important were they held to be that they led to a declaration of independent sovereignty and to a separation through revolution. On the foundation of the Colonies and the Colonial Governments was established our Government, in which the people reserved unto themselves, to be exercised within the States and their subdivisions, the major elements of their sovereignty.

This is the Government we are sworn to uphold. The portion of the sovereignty of the people which they have surrendered, or, rather, agreed to exercise jointly under a National Government, is set out in the Constitution in language reasonably clear and explicit; and that is the instrument we are sworn to uphold and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic, which includes well-meaning enemies as well as willfully wicked ones.

We realize that such a government has its faults, its weaknesses, along certain lines and in certain directions. It is scarcely to be hoped that such a government will be as constantly forcefully effective and as uniform in the enforcement of all the laws as it is conceivable a centralized power might be. We must admit that at infrequent times and in various localities the local arm of the law under our system is weak and ineffective and temporarily fails to adequately protect life or property, and we realize that one can imagine a centralized government comparatively free from such temporary local inefficiency. But, nevertheless and notwithstanding, we still adhere to the view that as eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, so local responsibility and local exercise of authority is the price of that interest in and aptitude for government, among the masses of the people, which arms and supports them in the exercise of that vigilance which perpetuates liberty.

What I have just said is not intended as the opening of a Fourth of July oration or of a dissertation on American Government. It is preliminary to some observations which I shall

make with respect to what, I regret to say, seems to be a very live issue. On May 9 last Mr. LEE of Georgia reported from the Committee on Agriculture a bill entitled "A bill for the protection of migratory and insectivorous game birds of the United States." A short time before that, namely, on April 26, 1912, Senator McLEAN reported from the Senate Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game a bill entitled "A bill to protect migratory game and insectivorous birds in the United States." On January 22, 1913, the said bill passed the Senate without any real debate and practically by unanimous consent. This bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, was ordered reported, and is, I believe, now on the calendar.

If to-morrow morning all the people of the United States were to realize that their sovereignty and control over a very important matter had been wiped out or attempted to be abrogated, that all of the statutes on all of the statute books of all the States on an important subject had been repealed or attempted to be made nugatory by an act of Congress; if they knew that Congress was proposing an army of Federal officials, armed with power to make arrests anywhere within the States for trifling offenses the nature and character of which neither they nor their immediate or their more distant representatives had any hand in defining or had any control in modifying; if they could realize, for instance, that under this proposed legislation a barefoot boy in any State in the Union might be arrested, taken before a Federal judge hundreds of miles from his home, sentenced to pay a heavy fine and to imprisonment for shooting a blackbird he found digging up his garden patch; if they were aware that a farmer, who in attempting to protect his field of young corn from the invasion of a colony of crows had shot one of them, might be put to all the expense and subjected to all the annoyance and disgrace incident to a trial in a Federal court, fined, and imprisoned for an act which was not in violation of any local statute or contrary to any local or State-wide opinion as to the thing done being in any wise improper; if people could fully understand these things, and could further realize what such an extension or attempted extension of Federal police power means and what it inevitably leads to, instead of there being a general acquiescence in this legislation and few protests against it, there would be such a cloud of protest as we have not heard in a generation.

It is 18 years since the beginning of my service here. In all that time there has been no legislation reported that has approached this in its revolutionary character.

It is urged on the ground of necessity. It is claimed that some clerk in the Department of Agriculture a number of years ago, without responsibility, probably with little information, but with much imagination, said that insects were destroying \$800,000,000 worth of agricultural products per annum. How much of pure imagination there was in that no one knows; certainly not the man who wrote it. How much of such destruction is avoidable if the country were covered with insect-destroying birds nobody knows. The probability is that the guess was a tremendously exaggerated one, born of that desire which burns in the heart of every bureau chief to increase his appropriations and enhance his power and authority. [Applause.]

The question as to whether this damage, large or small, could be to any extent minimized if all the wild feathered creatures in the world were protected from destruction by human agencies forevermore nobody knows. The probability is that such protection would have comparatively little effect.

But admitting for the sake of argument that there is little exaggeration in the eight hundred millions, that it is largely avoidable, shall we change the character of the Government that our fathers gave us because of the hope in the breasts of some gentlemen that we may be able to partly stop this destruction? Oh, but gentlemen say "there is no considerable extension of Federal authority." On the contrary, it is the first irrevocable step toward the ultimate, complete extension of Federal police authority and the extinction of local authority. Enact this legislation and there is no justification for a stand against the most extreme assertion of Federal police power in the States of the Union.

As a people, it is said to our discredit that of all civilized peoples we least effectively protect human life, the most sacred of all things. I presume that is exaggerated, but it is a generally accepted statement. At any rate homicides are, God knows, too common. Lynchings, burnings, assaults are common, and no one section can point the finger of scorn at another and charge it as being more guilty than all others in these things.

The newspapers recently gave us, in all their horrid and gruesome details, the story of the burning of a human being charged

with the crime of murder. We were informed that the mob of men and boys who chained this poor unfortunate to an iron pump in the front yard of a building dedicated to the administration of law and the dispensation of justice, covered him with tar and applied the torch, was the same mob which a few hours before had similarly tortured and murdered an innocent man for the same crime. So frequently as to bring down upon us the merited reproach of civilized men everywhere are these outbreaks of organized violence, holdups, assaults, murders, and lynchings, and yet do we hear any suggestion of invoking the strong and effective arm of the National Government to protect human life and punish those who wantonly, vengefully, and cruelly take it?

And why not? Because under our form of government the duty and the power to protect and punish rests with the people locally. If it were proposed that the Central Government be called upon to protect human life and punish its taking, what a chorus of protests there would be against it on the ground of its unconstitutionality. But because the people in some of the States have failed somewhat in properly protecting bird life, because some gentlemen want the hunting improved for their benefit, because in some States gentlemen desire to place on the Federal Government the burden and expense of protecting game birds they propose, and many good people approve, an extension of Federal authority which would not be sanctioned for the protection of human life.

A year or two ago local conditions in a great State of the Union noted for its general enforcement of the law, so broke down local government as to lead to the unchecked and unpunished destruction of millions of dollars' worth of property, the burning of barns and tobacco warehouses. Has anyone proposed in this admitted temporary failure of local government, in its protection of property, the strong arm of the Federal Government should be invoked? No; and why? Because we realize that while the arm of the centralized power might furnish better protection in such cases than the temporarily weak and inefficient local arm—

Mr. SLAYDEN. Why should it?

Mr. MONDELL. It would possibly be free from local influences; that is the verdict of history; but—and there is the rub—in the long run tyranny would be established and the liberties of the people taken from them in the hope of establishing more stable and effective enforcement of law.

But I suppose we are expected to adopt the view that the birds, to those who love them—and no one loves them more than I—are more valuable than human life, and that we may change our Government and its institutions fundamentally for their protection when no one would suggest it for the protection of property or human life.

Much is said in official reports as to the destruction of insect-destroying birds and the consequent increase of insect life, but when we come to the hearings and the arguments made before the committee we find that certain gentlemen are disturbed because the ducks and geese are not as plentiful as they used to be and shooting is not quite so good on private preserves as they would like to have. No one is so foolish as to imagine that the multiplication of water fowl would in any appreciable degree lead to the destruction of insects, for these creatures do not to any considerable extent live upon crop-destroying insects.

As a boy I lived in northern Iowa. The air in the spring and fall was filled with the flying millions of geese and brant and swan and ducks of every hue and name and kind. The uplands and lowlands were vibrant and vocal with bird life, and for five years all of our crops were destroyed by grasshoppers. [Laughter.] One report has it that the grasshopper invasion was due to the destruction of birds. Why, bless your soul, in that great dry Northwest, where those creatures under favorable conditions breed mightily, there was practically no population save a few arrow-bearing savages, and in the territory which they devastated bird life was gloriously plentiful.

In the native habitat of the grasshopper the seasons were for several years dry and free from frost in the period of hatching. They were favorable for years to the increasing hordes of locusts; but, under other conditions in the regions they migrated to and devastated, nature finally weakened them and parasites attacked them. The same nature which in its favorable mood and aspect favored their increase, through rain and frost and parasites wiped them from the face of the earth and they were seen no more; they were destroyed save in diminished numbers in their native habitat, where they now sometimes so increase as to be locally destructive.

I shall not at length discuss the constitutionality of this legislation. I will leave that for the lawyers. I could not do it without expressing an opinion of the views of gentlemen who favor it from a constitutional standpoint, which I think no Mem-

ber should express in regard to a colleague. [Laughter.] Some of them claim that a bird is interstate commerce. I have never heard of the consignee or the consignor of the blackbird or the crow or the brant that wings its flight across the blue vault of heaven.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is speaking about live birds.

Mr. MONDELL. Dead birds are property, and if they get into interstate trade they are interstate commerce and under control of the Federal Government.

Some say that as migratory birds are sometimes in one State and sometimes in another they are the property of the United States, and therefore subject to its protection. I confess I am utterly unable to grasp this refinement of alleged logic; but if we admit that game, by crossing a State line, can become property and the property of the United States, we are then no nearer a constitutional excuse for the legislation than before, for the Federal Government has no police power in the States in the protection of its property not on Federal ground. It must depend upon the States for such protection.

The fact is that the most ingenious torturing of the Federal Constitution can not develop the shadow of an excuse for such legislation as is proposed. The birds referred to are game. The Supreme Court has declared the sovereign power of the State over them, and no flight can change their character.

But I should not support the legislation, even though devilish ingenuity might devise so devious an argument as to seem to bring it within the powers of the Federal Government, for it proposes a plan and scheme in direct conflict with the plan of self-government under which we live.

Under this legislation, if it could become effective, practically every flying thing in the State I represent here, save, perhaps, the grouse and a few owls and bats and butterflies, would be under the control of the Federal Government. What is worse, the nature and character of the offenses for which the people I represent could be indicted by a Federal grand jury, summoned before a Federal court, and fined and imprisoned, would be determined by a bureau chief in the Department of Agriculture. It is true that the Secretary of Agriculture is supposed to have something to say about it; that the President, in the midst of his multitudinous duties, is supposed to sign the edict prepared in the Bureau of Biology; but our experience of the workings of bureau government teaches us that the real lawmaker would be a civil-service bureau official in no wise responsible to the people affected by his edicts.

Under the proposed legislation a bureau of the Agricultural Department would constitute crimes, punishable by fine and imprisonment in a Federal prison, a multitude of acts involving no moral turpitude and of a relatively trifling and harmless character. Not only might the killing, capturing, or taking of a wild bird or fowl at any season of the year be prohibited, but the destruction of the nest of the most insignificant member of the bird family by a mischievous boy might subject him to all the penalties I have referred to. The possession of a blackbird's wing, the wearing of a bit of bird plumage, would no doubt be held prima facie evidence of heinous crimes. Even our duck hunters in the North and quail hunters in the South, so anxious to have Uncle Sam insure them good hunting, might not be so happy if the lawmaker in the bureau concluded it would be a good idea to take advantage of this law to prohibit all killing of such birds.

Of course, gentlemen who support such a measure could, if it became a law, meet the angry protests of their outraged constituents by insisting that they were not responsible for the abuse of Federal power under it, because they do not define, except in the most general terms, the acts to be prohibited and punished. They can tell their constituents that all they did was to turn them over to the tender mercies of a Federal bureau to admonish and punish as it saw fit.

The opportunities for Federal expenditure under the bill are limitless. It places all feathered things, with few exceptions, under the protection of the Federal Government; that means, of course, that the States are prohibited from doing anything for bird protection unless they see fit to trail along after the bureau and enforce its sovereign decrees. The Federal Government would therefore be under obligation to have enough sleuths, spies, agents, and marshals in every nook and corner of the land to see that no hungry citizen shot a snipe, no small boy trapped a crow, and that no country maiden wore a bobolink's wing in her hat.

Of course, such sleuths could also be employed for the highly uplifting purpose of guarding private preserves until such time as, under the rules of an obliging bureau, a favored few were given an opportunity to kill to their heart's content. In our boyhood days we read with throbbing pulses of the mighty hunts

and drives on the great game preserves of hereditary princes; all such performances pale into insignificance in the light of the glorious possibilities of gaming privileges which might be enjoyed under the regulations authorized by this act. Regulations they call them; regulations that rob every State of its sovereignty and place every citizen in jeopardy of trial, far from home, and fine and imprisonment for trifling offenses.

And what is it all about? The protection of insect-destroying birds is put forward as the foremost excuse, but read the appeals made on behalf of the law and you will find that the hunter of feathered game is the one most anxious for the legislation. The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hand of Esau. In some parts of the South the negroes are killing the game birds and rendering them scarce, so they tell us, and they want Uncle Sam to restrain them. The declaration by Uncle Sam of a closed season for colored men might be objected to as unconstitutional, but a Federally declared and enforced closed season for the feathered game the black man seeks is desired.

Too many ducks are killed in Louisiana and Mississippi and Florida, we are told, and in Texas it is claimed they allow the wholesale killing of robins; that appeals to me, for I love robins, but I have not so despaired of Texas and her sense of decency and obligation as a member of the sisterhood of States that I feel it is necessary to jeopardize our liberties and change our form of government in order to attempt to protect the robins there. We are gravely assured that our bird life will become extinct if we do not do this particular thing, and the extinction of the passenger pigeon is repeatedly held up as a fearful example of what will happen.

The extinction of the passenger pigeon is to be regretted, but no one has given us any evidence that this peculiar bird ever performed any very useful service to mankind. Its habits rendered it valueless as an insect destroyer of any particular efficiency. In large numbers it was a nuisance and it suddenly disappeared, just how or why no one knows. That the last remnant of the tribe perished at the hand of man is not at all likely. It could not adapt itself to even slightly modified environment and passed away a considerable sentimental but no great practical loss.

The passing of the great auk is another one of the awful examples of the passing of bird life which it is sought to prevent. As the great auk never came south of the Arctic Circle and never ate the bugs and insects which annoy us, our people are hardly chargeable with its destruction, or our insect pests increased thereby. We should, of course, protect bird life, but the duck and geese hunters who imagine that the Federal Government can or will restore the condition which existed before our swamps were drained and our country settled will be disappointed. Our insect-destroying birds merit and demand our protection for the useful service they render.

The value of that service has unquestionably been exaggerated; but, making due allowance for these exaggerations, they are of great value though coupled with their protection of our crops is their destruction of our grain and fruit. Our song birds should above all be protected, for they are not only insect destroyers but they add greatly to our enjoyment; they cheer and stimulate us with their songs. A considerable reduction of their numbers would be a serious loss both from a practical and sentimental standpoint.

But all these can be protected without overthrowing or defacing the Constitution, without any dangerous and unnecessary extension of Federal authority, without invasion of the domain of local government, without the creation of an army of Federal spies and agents, without delegating to a bureau of the Government the power to harass, annoy, fine, and imprison our people for trifling offenses.

In most of the States of the Union there is a healthy and growing public sentiment favorable to the protection of bird life. In fact, the testimony is that most of the States are reasonably protecting bird life. I have faith that if the attention of the legislatures of the few States claimed to be derelict in their duty, such as the Gulf States, are appealed to they can be depended upon to pass laws which will adequately protect not only the birds temporarily sojourning there but all other birds. I refuse to believe that the people of any State in the Union are so inordinately selfish as to take advantage of their peculiar situation and condition as to slaughter birds, to the great harm and injury of other sections of the Union.

Many of the illustrations of diminishing bird life used to excuse the passage of this legislation relate to birds of the grouse family, to sage hens, prairie chickens, and quail. If there is any considerable class of birds whose protection is not made the duty of the Federal Government under the legislation in question, it is these birds. They are not in the generally accepted sense of the term migratory. Their care and protec-

tion is necessarily a local matter. They could not be legally cared for by the Federal Government under the proposed legislation, though unquestionably an effort would be made to so construe the legislation as to justify placing upon the Federal Government the cost of protecting these localized birds.

In conclusion, I have only to say that I have great faith in the capacity of the American people for self-government. I have great faith in the disposition and ability of the people in our Commonwealths to do their duty not only to their own citizens but to the entire citizenship of the Nation. There is a way to protect bird life without invoking bureaucratic Federal rule. The various States are now proceeding along these lines; and enlightened public sentiment, properly directed, can be depended upon to extend and enlarge the scope of local protection until it meets every reasonable demand and requirement of the situation.

The bill referred to is as follows:

S. 6497. An act to protect migratory game and insectivorous birds in the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That all wild geese, wild swans, brant, wild ducks, snipe, plover, woodcock, rail, wild pigeons, and all other migratory game and insectivorous birds which in their northern and southern migrations pass through or do not remain permanently the entire year within the borders of any State or Territory, shall hereafter be deemed to be within the custody and protection of the Government of the United States, and shall not be destroyed or taken contrary to regulations hereinafter provided therefor.

Sec. 2. That the Department of Agriculture is hereby authorized to adopt suitable regulations to give effect to the previous section by prescribing and fixing closed seasons, having due regard to the zones of temperature, breeding habits, and times and line of migratory flight, thereby enabling the department to select and designate suitable districts for different portions of the country within which said closed seasons it shall not be lawful to shoot or by any device kill or seize and capture migratory birds within the protection of this law, and by declaring penalties by fine of not more than \$100 or imprisonment for 90 days, or both, for violations of such regulations.

Sec. 3. That the Department of Agriculture, after the preparation of said regulations, shall cause the same to be made public, and shall allow a period of three months in which said regulations may be examined and considered before final adoption, permitting, when deemed proper, public hearings thereon, and after final adoption to cause same to be engrossed and submitted to the President of the United States for approval: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to affect or interfere with the local laws of the States and Territories for the protection of nonmigratory game or other birds resident and breeding within their borders, nor to prevent the States and Territories from enacting laws and regulations to promote and render efficient the regulations of the Department of Agriculture provided under this statute.

Sec. 4. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, the sum of \$10,000.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FOSTER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 27944. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. R. 27986. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. R. 27987. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minn.; and

H. R. 27988. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minn.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3843) granting to the coal-mining companies in the State of Oklahoma the right to acquire additional acreage adjoining their mine leases, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. CLAPP, and Mr. OWEN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 22871) to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PAGE, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia as the said conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 23293) for the protection of the water supply of the city of Colorado Springs and the town of Manitou, Colo., disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SMOOT, Mr. GUGGENHEIM, and Mr. NEWLANDS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amend-

ment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8861) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Schiffer.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 109) to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 8034) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 7160) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That at 10 minutes before 1 o'clock on Wednesday, February 12, 1913, the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to take part in the count of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KINDRED].

[Mr. KINDRED addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has only 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMB. Then I yield 24 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, no bill comes before the American Congress that is of more general interest and far-reaching importance than the Agricultural appropriation bill. Never before in the history of the country have the farmers taken the interest in their own affairs that they are taking now. They are becoming genuinely aroused to the importance of their work in the fields of agriculture. [Applause.]

In the brief time that I shall address the House to-day I will not undertake to discuss the various subjects enumerated in this Agricultural appropriation bill. I want to discuss this morning one of the most important, if not the most important, agricultural products of our country, and that is the subject of cotton. R. G. Dun & Co. in their annual report say truly that cotton has proven itself to be one of the country's most valuable assets. We export millions of dollars' worth of agricultural products every year, but it remains for cotton to give to America the balance of trade. Besides being useful in various ways amongst our own people, it occupies first place in our trade with foreign countries. I insist, Mr. Chairman, in the light of these facts, that the section of country that produces nearly two-thirds of the world's cotton supply, whose product brings to America the balance of trade, is entitled to be represented in the Diplomatic and Consular Service in the cotton-using countries of the earth by men who know something about cotton, its uses and benefits, and who could in their representative capacity exploit cotton and cotton goods to the advantage of the producer, the manufacturer, and the country at large. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to say to my friend that the day is coming pretty soon when a Democratic President will appoint men from the South in that service.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; and it is my purpose to call his attention to the situation and to urge upon him the importance of appointing competent men from the cotton-producing section, and I believe that he will do so. I want to say in this connection that the consular reports on trade conditions abroad and the information regarding the desire of various sections of procuring American products have been of great value and have increased our trade with foreign countries along many lines. I am sorry to say, however, that the cotton industry of the United States has not been and is not now represented in the Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Do they raise cotton in Cuba?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am not quite sure; but I do not think they do. I want Cuba to buy her cotton and cotton goods from us, and I want some good man under the Wilson administration to represent us at Cuba, and the gentleman from Colorado, who is himself a southerner, would fill that position well. [Applause.]

Judge HULL, of Tennessee, in a magnificent speech delivered in this House February 11, 1910, called attention to a bulletin issued by the Census Bureau regarding the importance of cotton.

I wish to read briefly from that bulletin:

As two-thirds of our raw material is utilized by European manufacturers in the production of goods, which are generally of a finer quality than that of the goods made here, the value of the manufactures made from the average American cotton crop is estimated at not less than \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say just here that, in view of the facts stated in the bulletin read by Judge HULL on that occasion, the people that produce such an important product as cotton is ought never to receive less than 15 cents per pound for cotton. Judge HULL, commenting upon the Consular Service as conducted to-day, said:

We have about 57 consuls general, and none are selected from cotton States to positions in countries that buy American cotton. Only three—one from Virginia and two from Missouri—are from the cotton section, and they are appointed in the lower classes of the service and to minor and unimportant stations outside of the cotton-purchasing countries.

Continuing, he said:

This Government has 241 consuls stationed in the various foreign countries. They are divided into nine classes, according to salary and importance of station to which appointed. From this entire number of consuls only five stations in European countries are filled by appointments from cotton States, and with one or two exceptions these stations are of trifling commercial importance.

I want to read here, Mr. Chairman, an article that Judge HULL read on the occasion referred to. The article was written by Mr. R. H. Watkins, a representative of the press in Washington.

There are 12 Southern States—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—whose cotton exports alone enable the United States to maintain a comfortable balance of trade with the world.

In all the great cotton-buying countries of Europe there is not in any diplomatic or consular position of importance and respectability a single man from a cotton-growing State representing the United States Government.

Great Britain—

He says—

buys 40 per cent of the cotton we export, yet nowhere in all the vast domain of the British Empire, weaving our cotton into fabrics for the hundreds of millions of the inhabitants of her possessions, there is not one consul from a Southern State representing the United States.

In China, where we have great hopes for development of our cotton trade, the eight consuls are from New York, Massachusetts, California, Minnesota, Indiana, and Ohio.

There are 333 Americans in the Consular Service, and of these 31 are from Southern States.

In the Diplomatic Service in positions of responsibility the number employed is 108, of which there are 13 from the Southern States.

Mr. Chairman, these facts disclose a deplorable situation. Just think of it. If a considerable per cent of these men were selected from the cotton-growing section of the country, how much value they would be not only to those who produce this great article of commerce, but to the United States in extending and expanding its trade in cotton. Let me in this connection read from Judge HULL's speech:

Mr. Chairman, it may be remarked that the great Empire of Japan, as much as it consumes, never purchased any material quantity of cotton from the United States until 1898, when a traveling representative of American agriculture visited the buyers there and familiarized them with our cotton-trade conditions. Yet Japan used a great deal of American cotton, but it was purchased from the English dealers in London. The United Kingdom, France, and Germany purchase three-fourths of our cotton exports. Still our people who raise and sell it are, and for years have been, denied the great advantage of intelligent and efficient representation in those countries through our Consular Service.

Mr. Chairman, it is in the interest of fair play and good business sense that I demand that the South be represented in the Diplomatic and Consular Service of the United States, and I believe that the great Democrat who is soon to become President of the United States will give the South fair and due representation in the great Diplomatic and Consular Service of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the man who produces cotton in the United States renders a great service to his country and to the world, and yet he is greatly imposed upon by conditions that could be but have not yet been prevented by law. For instance, the gambling exchange, without regard to the size of the crop, uses the word "cotton" in selling two or three hundred million bales in a season. As I have said before in this House, they do not

own cotton and they do not have to deliver cotton on contracts. There is an endless chain of buying and selling and settling the differences between the party buying and the party selling with money, and hence no demand is made on the cotton producer for cotton with which to fill the contract. This kind of dealing hinders the full and free operation of the law of supply and demand, and injures the price of real cotton. [Applause.] I have always contended that these gamblers on the exchange have no right to sell in unlimited quantities a fictitious stuff whose name represents the farmers' produce and never call on him for the real produce while they are fixing the market price without his aid or consent. Not only is this fictitious stuff called cotton handled in unlimited amounts, but the bear speculators send out broadcast false reports regarding the productive prospects of the crop and conditions surrounding the sale of the manufactured product. If it rains too much and the crop is damaged, the bears circulate the report that crop prospects were never better; if the farmer reduces his cotton acreage, they declare that he has planted more ground in cotton than ever before; if the drought comes and the blooms and squares parch and fall upon the ground, the bear predicts a bumper crop. These are some of the evils, Mr. Chairman, that lurk in the dark places of the exchange. If all men who are interested in cotton were compelled to deal in real cotton and to call on the cotton producer for cotton, the law of supply and demand would regulate the price, and the producer would then exercise a right that belongs to him—that of doing something toward fixing the price of his own product.

Mr. Chairman, a cotton exchange ought to be a place where real cotton is bought and sold or cotton in the process of production, where the delivery of real cotton is expected to be had; but a cotton exchange that substitutes the word "cotton" for real cotton serves no legitimate purpose. It does not help distribute the crop. It works injury to the producer and is inexcusable and indefensible. For a long time I have advocated laws looking to the regulation of the cotton exchanges of the United States, and I have contributed toward the passage of two bills through this House looking to the regulation of these exchanges; but I am sorry to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate permitted both of these bills to die. In the Agricultural appropriation bill we have provided for the institution of a bureau of markets in the Department of Agriculture. This bureau will gather information regarding the price and demand for farm products, and this information will be printed and distributed throughout the country. Our newspapers will have access to this information, and by publishing it day after day and week after week the farmers of the South, the North, the East, and the West will be informed as to the demand for their products in the various sections of the country and the price that their produce would bring in those markets. In my judgment the work that will be done by this bureau of markets will encourage the building and operating of spot-cotton exchanges in the cotton belt. The information will be reliable information so different from the kind we get now from the bear speculators, who write their reports for the purpose of beating down the price and not for the purpose of acquainting the public with the truth of the market situation.

Mr. Chairman, there is another evil connected with the cotton exchange that I desire briefly to discuss, and that is the injury done the cotton producer by what is called the revision committee of the New York Cotton Exchange. On February 6 the Washington Star published this special from New York:

The fact that the revision committee had made no change in spot-cotton differences at the meeting last night had added somewhat to the confidence of early buyers.

Mr. Chairman, just think of it, a committee of perhaps a half dozen men on the New York exchange have it in their power to fix the difference in the price of different grades of cotton, having the bears waiting on the one hand and the bulls anxious on the other for them to announce their decision as to how many points of difference there are in the price between one grade of cotton and another.

No cotton producer is on that committee. What does this committee on fixed differences do? Why, it fixes of its own motion without regard to commercial value or fitness for spinning purposes the difference between 22 different imaginary grades of cotton. For instance, it has the power to say that a certain grade shall sell for 40 points lower than a certain other grade, and so on down, and by the action of that committee the cotton farmer is robbed of \$2.20 on a bale of cotton, and on a crop of 14,000,000 bales he is robbed of more than \$28,000,000. It is horrible to think of. The power to take that much money from the producer on the fixed difference between two grades of cotton is lodged in the hands of the committee on fixed differences on the New York Cotton Exchange. Just think of the robbery

and plunder that is going on through this farcical process of fixed differences between 22 different grades of cotton. [Applause.] If a man buys a popular grade and wants to hold it for a better price, and thus by his holding makes it hard for the bear gambler to beat down the price, the committee on fixed differences can meet and outlaw the grade that he has bought and is holding by declaring it to be of less value than it formerly was.

Then, Mr. Chairman, they impose on the producer in another way. They have set up for their peculiar speculating purposes 22 different grades of cotton, when the fact is there are only 4 grades of cotton commonly used in buying and selling cotton in the spot markets of the country. These grades are: Good ordinary, strict good ordinary, middling, and strict middling. These 4 grades cover the grades of cotton produced on the farm, but it takes 22 imaginary grades to cover the fictitious stuff handled on the New York Cotton Exchange.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that if there is to be a committee on fixed differences of cotton grades anywhere it should be composed of expert graders and classifiers from the ranks of the cotton producers and cotton spinners of the United States, and that committee could represent the Government in the bureau of markets. I do not mean that that committee should have the power to say that this grade is worth 20 points more or less than that grade, but simply to say that this sample of cotton does or does not belong to a certain grade and not change that decision every few days. This committee on fixed differences on the New York Cotton Exchange works untold injury to the cotton producer every year.

There is another evil in connection with the cotton industry of the United States, and that is in connection with the Government report of cotton ginned. The reports now published by the Census Bureau read:

Number of bales of cotton ginned from the growth of 1912.

Mr. Chairman, that report includes linters. This ought not to be. The cotton used by the spinner in the manufacture of cloth is the fiber cut from the seed at the first ginning and is properly called cotton. It can be used and is used for any and all kinds of spinning purposes, but linters is not cotton. It is the fuzzy covering of the seed and will not come off with the cotton fiber when the cotton is ginned. It occupies the same relation to cotton that seconds and shorts occupy to flour. It requires a different kind of gin to shave this close, clinging, fuzzy stuff from the seed. It is not used as real cotton is used, and it ought not to be counted in the ginner's report of cotton to be used for spinning purposes. It is used to make cheap mattresses, and is used as wood pulp is used, a great deal of it, in making paper, and is the finest paper material in the world. It ought to be reported as a separate and distinct item and not counted in with cotton ginned. It is misleading and confusing.

Now, the ginner's report simply says so many bales, including linters, have been ginned up to a certain time. Mr. Chairman, thousands of people, yes, millions of people do not know what linters mean, and the impression is made that it is all cotton. This impression works injury to the farmer, for linters sell for 2 or 3 cents per pound when cotton is bringing 12 cents and more per pound, and yet bear speculators use linters in their efforts to make the public believe that the ginner's report means all cotton when such is not the case. Let me illustrate: The ginner's report up to January 16, 1913, says that 13,000,000 bales have been ginned. This report is misleading and injures the cotton producer, because it leads the cotton-using world to believe that the report means 13,000,000 bales of spinnable cotton, when the fact is that nearly 400,000 of these counted as cotton bales are linters.

Take the bales of linters from the bales of real cotton and we have, up to January 16, ginned only 12,600,000 bales of spinnable cotton instead of 13,000,000 bales, as the report leads the cotton-using world to believe. Mr. Chairman, I mention this matter now for the purpose of calling the attention of the House and the country to the injustice done the cotton producer by permitting these two reports to come under the report of cotton ginned. During the next Congress I am going to try to separate these reports and let the report of spinnable cotton ginned stand in a column to itself. I want the report of cotton ginned up to a given time to mean cotton, so that the world may know that it means spinnable cotton and not linters. Now, Mr. Chairman, if we can separate cotton from linters and do away with the committee on fixed differences and regulate the cotton exchanges so that real cotton will figure in the transactions of the exchange and compel real delivery on contracts, the exchange will be a help and not a hindrance, a blessing and not a curse to the cotton producer. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. What has become of the gentleman's bill on that subject? What is the status of that bill now?

Mr. HEFLIN. I introduced a bill on the subject, so did other gentlemen from the cotton-growing States, and we made up a bill representing our views and that is the bill I referred to a moment ago. We passed that bill through the House, but it died in the Senate. We also passed a bill during the Sixty-first Congress that met the same fate in the Senate. I wish to express the belief that during the next Congress we will enact into law provisions that will strike down the evils of the gambling exchange and make all the cotton exchanges of the country legitimate, helpful agencies in the cotton world. I want to say in this connection that I do not want to put out of business any cotton exchange that is conducted on honest business principles.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman said some time ago that the bills regulating cotton exchanges which were passed by the House died in the Senate. Were they ever reported out of the Committee on Agriculture in the Senate?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not think that they were.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. They are still in the Committee on Agriculture in the Senate?

Mr. HEFLIN. That is my understanding, and when I say that they died in the Senate I mean that no action was taken upon them by that body.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a word about the crop of 1911. That was really a record-breaking crop. The South produced more cotton that year than ever was produced in the cotton belt before. The crop of 1912 is a short crop compared to the crop of 1911. The farmers all through the cotton belt reduced their cotton acreage, and the crop grown last year, when the tale is finally told, will be about 3,000,000 bales short of the crop of 1911. The season for gathering the crop was never better than the fall of 1912. Cotton opened rapidly throughout the cotton belt and the crop was gathered before Christmas, and the ginners' report for the 16th of January, subtracting the linters therefrom leaving 12,600,000 bales, has come within about 400,000 bales of spinable cotton of telling the tale of cotton production for the year 1912. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to read a letter that I sent out to different men in the cotton belt November 27, 1912:

LAFAYETTE, ALA., November 27, 1912.

MY DEAR SIR: The estimate of the cotton crop of 1912 will be announced by the Department of Agriculture December 12, and I want to have all the information possible on the subject. Please give me your estimate of the reduction in cotton acreage in your State, your opinion as to the amount of cotton that will be produced in your State, and how much cotton remains to be picked and ginned. And counting the cost of production, etc., I want your opinion as to what price you think the farmer should receive for this crop.

Please write me at Washington, D. C., House of Representatives.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours, very truly,

J. THOMAS HEFLIN.

I desire now to read a letter from Hon. E. J. Watson, commissioner of agriculture of the State of South Carolina, as characteristic of the other letters that I received from Mississippi, Oklahoma, Georgia, Texas, Alabama, and North Carolina:

COLUMBIA, S. C., December 4, 1912.

Hon. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of November 27 has been received.

I note carefully the several requests made and beg to reply, after most careful consideration, as follows:

The cotton acreage in this State in the year 1911 was 2,705,000. This year there was a reduction of at least 10 per cent in this acreage.

The production of South Carolina this year will not, in my opinion, exceed 1,300,000 running bales, and I doubt very much if it will reach that figure.

Up to December 1 more than 90 per cent of the crop had been picked and practically all of that picked had been ginned. Indeed, practically the entire crop had been harvested and sent to the gin.

Taking carefully into consideration everything relating to the cost of production and marketing, in my opinion the producer of cotton is entitled to and ought to receive at least 15 cents per pound for this year's crop.

Trusting that the above is the information desired, believe me,

Very truly, yours,

E. J. WATSON, Commissioner.

There was 10 per cent reduction in cotton acreage in Mississippi, 25 per cent in Oklahoma, 10 per cent in South Carolina, 15 per cent in Georgia, 2 per cent in Texas, 20 per cent in Alabama, and 15 per cent in North Carolina. In spite of these facts the bear speculators all during the year circulated reports to the effect that cotton acreage had been increased and that we would make another big crop like that of 1911. Mr. Chairman, but for the false reports circulated by bear gamblers on the exchanges and the fictitious stuff they are allowed to handle and call cotton, the law of supply and demand would have operated through this selling season and the cotton producers would

have gotten a cent and a half or two cents a pound more than they received for this crop. The spindles of this and other countries have been operating full time and the cotton-goods trade has been good everywhere, and the price that has obtained for cotton goods justify these gentlemen who have written to me from all over the cotton belt and justify me in the demand for 15 cents per pound for cotton. [Applause.] I want to educate the country to the fact that the cost of production is so great that the cotton producer can not realize a fair and reasonable profit unless he does receive 15 cents per pound. The men who produce this product that brings to America the balance of trade are entitled to fair treatment at the hands of the American Congress, and the House has manifested its desire to see justice done to the cotton producer. It has gone on record voting for a law that would protect him from the evils of the gambling exchange, and I thank you gentleman for that great body of men who produce cotton, men who simply want a fair deal, reasonable prices, and living profits. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. LAMB. Now, Mr. Chairman, that we are through with eloquence, poetry, and State rights, I ask that the bill be read for amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, office of the Secretary of Agriculture: Secretary of Agriculture, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$5,000; solicitor, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$3,000, and \$500 additional as custodian of buildings; private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,500; stenographer and executive clerk to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,250; private secretary to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$1,600; stenographer to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$1,400; 1 appointment clerk, \$2,000; 1 Chief of Supply Division, \$2,000; 1 inspector, \$2,750; 1 law clerk, \$3,000; 2 law clerks, at \$2,500 each; 1 law clerk, \$2,200; 10 law clerks, at \$2,000 each; 8 law clerks, at \$1,800 each; 3 law clerks, at \$1,600 each; 1 special agent on exhibits, \$3,000; 1 telegraph and telephone operator, \$1,600; 2 clerks, class 4; 6 clerks, class 3; 10 clerks, class 2; 18 clerks, class 1; 8 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 6 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 14 messengers or laborers, at \$840 each; 10 assistant messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 1 chief engineer, who shall be captain of the watch, \$2,000; 1 assistant chief engineer, \$1,400; 1 assistant engineer, \$1,200; 2 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 7 firemen, at \$720 each; 8 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 1 construction inspector, \$1,400; 5 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,200 each; 2 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,100 each; 8 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,020 each; 2 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$900 each; 1 electrician, \$1,100; 1 electrical wireman, \$1,000; 1 electrical wireman, \$900; 2 electrician's helpers, at \$720 each; 2 painters, at \$1,000 each; 2 painters, at \$900 each; 5 plumbers or steam fitters, at \$1,020 each; 1 plumber's helper, \$840; 2 plumber's helpers, at \$720 each; 1 blacksmith, \$900; 1 lieutenant of the watch, \$1,000; 34 watchmen, at \$720 each; 5 mechanics, at \$1,200 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$960 each; 1 janitor, \$900; 18 assistant messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 21 laborers, messenger boys, or charwomen, at \$480 each; 1 charwoman, \$540; 8 charwomen, at \$240 each; for extra labor and emergency employments, \$14,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Fowler] reserves a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture why it is that a solicitor at \$5,000 is carried in the paragraph, and also a chief clerk carried at \$3,000, with an additional salary of \$500, making \$3,500 as a total salary for the chief clerk?

Mr. LAMB. That has been the custom for the last four or five Congresses and has been enacted into law.

Mr. FOWLER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that his bill last year, when he brought it in, carried a salary of \$4,500 for the solicitor?

Mr. LAMB. I think \$500 was put on in the Senate last year and agreed to in conference.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the solicitor and the salary carried therefor. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire—

Mr. LAMB. I will ask the gentleman to reserve the point of order. I do not think this salary is subject to a point of order at all. It is the current law.

Mr. FOWLER. My point of order in brief is—

Mr. LAMB. There is no change from last year at all in this, and I do not think the point of order will lie.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the solicitor in this bill had been carried in rather a loose way without any authority of law. By the act of 1910, which was a general appropriation bill, it was provided that hereafter certain duties should be discharged by the solicitor. In the last appropriation bill as it was reported to the House his salary was carried at \$4,500. A point of order was made against this solicitor, not as to the salary, but as to the authority to carry a solicitor therein, the point being made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK]. It was ably argued here upon the floor of the House, and Mr. BORLAND, at that time being in the chair, ruled that

the law of 1910, which was a general appropriation bill containing the word "hereafter" and providing that certain duties should "hereafter" be performed by a solicitor, authorized the office of solicitor, but the question as to the salary was not raised at all.

I make the point of order against that part of the paragraph because it carries more than the law carried in 1910 for this place when it had some kind of authority in permanent law for its existence as a portion of the paragraph.

Mr. LAMB. If my colleague will allow me to interrupt right there, I think I can save time by stating that this whole matter of the solicitorship was discussed here last year, and the authority to appoint him at all was challenged. The discussion to which he has referred, on the point of order made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], was thrashed out here, and it was plainly shown that not only did the law authorize the creating of this office, but that the very act creating a Department of Agriculture authorized the appointment of this solicitor. Section 523 of the statutes places it absolutely beyond question. So there is nothing in the point of order, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not making a point of order here for the purpose of consuming time, but I am making it because there is a foundation for it. I repeat that the bill as reported from the committee to the House last year carried only \$4,500. I assert that the bill in 1910, which carried with it some authority for creating a solicitor, carried with it only a salary of \$4,500. I have a quotation from the law as passed then. The salary of the solicitor at that time carried in the act of 1910, volume 36, page 416, was \$4,500.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman state that there is any statute fixing in so many words the salary of the solicitor of the Agricultural Department, or is his appointment left to the Secretary of Agriculture at such salary as Congress may appropriate for?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, there is no law creating the office of solicitor and fixing the salary.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is what I thought.

Mr. FOWLER. If it were left to the Secretary of Agriculture to make the appointment, there is a limitation upon his power which is fixed by permanent law, prohibiting him from fixing a salary, for any office that he may create, above \$3,000.

So, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that in the act of 1910, reported in the Statutes at Large, volume 36, page 416, there was a clause saying that certain duties hereafter shall be performed by a solicitor. Chairman BORLAND considered that to mean that the office of solicitor was created. At that time the bill carried a salary of \$4,500. In harmony with that law the honorable Committee on Agriculture reported its bill during the last session of Congress for a solicitor at \$4,500.

Mr. Chairman, it has been the universal ruling of the Chair, so far as I have been able to understand, that when an office has been created, or where it has been carried in an appropriation bill and the salary fixed therein, there can be no change thereafter, however many times it may have been in the current law, because of the fact that if it were permitted to increase these salaries indiscriminately there would be no end to the increase of salaries at the caprice of any who might see fit to favor his friend or to favor an individual.

Mr. Chairman, I have the ruling and the debate on this question before me, and if there is any question as to the correctness of my statement, I desire to read the report of the proceedings of the last session of this Congress upon this identical question, wherein the burden of contention was upon the right of the committee to provide for a solicitor and not upon the question of the salary. The Senate, after the bill passed the House, increased the salary from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

Mr. LAMB. That increase was made in the Senate last year. It was inserted by the conferees. Now, if I understand the gentleman right, it was not challenging the position of solicitor, but the question of our right to give him \$5,000, and makes a point of order on that.

Mr. FOWLER. My position is not against the provision for the solicitor, but against the authority to increase salaries.

Mr. LAMB. The same authority applies to the solicitor as to any other officer. We were asked to increase the salaries of all of them, but we refused to do it.

Mr. FOWLER. When the office was created the salary was \$4,500. Now you seek to increase it by making it \$5,000.

Mr. LAMB. It was \$5,000 last year.

Mr. FOWLER. You are trying to change existing law.

Mr. LAMB. Not at all.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know whether I have made myself clear, Mr. Chairman. The Chair was investigating the subject while I was discussing it. I desire to say that there was, in 1910, according to the ruling of the Chair, a permanent law passed creating the officer of Solicitor at a salary of \$4,500. This is an increase of a salary; it is changing permanent law, which I say this committee can not do.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, this same question was discussed here last year. We relied partially, but not wholly, upon section 523, which says:

Sec. 523. The Commissioner of Agriculture shall appoint a chief clerk, and he shall appoint such other employees as Congress may from time to time provide, with salaries corresponding to the salaries of similar officers in other departments of the Government; and he shall, as Congress may from time to time provide, employ other persons for such time as their services may be needed, including chemists, botanists, and other persons skilled in the natural sciences pertaining to agriculture.

We lodged our contention last year not entirely on this section, but in conjunction with the word "hereafter." There is nothing in the argument of the gentleman from Illinois as to the increase of salary to \$5,000, for we find that last year, and we continued the salary, as we had a right to do. I ask for a ruling.

Mr. FOWLER. But the Commissioner of Agriculture has not fixed this salary nor created the office. This Congress created the office in 1910 and fixed the salary at \$4,500, and the committee is trying to increase it now in defiance of existing law.

Mr. LAMB. Congress changed the amount of salary last year.

Mr. FOWLER. That is current law and not permanent law.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly.

Mr. COX. If I understand correctly, the office never was created until 1910?

Mr. FOWLER. That is according to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. COX. And it fixed the salary at \$4,500?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. COX. The gentleman's point of order is against the increase of the salary from \$4,500 to \$5,000?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman from Illinois is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair remembers the controversy which took place in the House on the consideration of the agricultural bill last year. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] directed a point of order against this item in the bill. Those supporting the item predicated that support upon the original act creating the Department of Agriculture, which authorized the head of that department to do certain things, and upon a statute that gave certain authority to various heads of departments; also upon the language contained in the agricultural appropriation act of 1910. That language is this:

Solicitor, \$4,500; hereafter the legal work of the Department of Agriculture shall be performed under the supervision and direction of the solicitor.

The recollection of the Chair is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] presided over the committee at that time and held that the point of order was not well taken, and suggested that even if the original act, or the provision of the statute to which I have referred, was not sufficient to authorize the provision, that the appropriation act of 1910 was in itself sufficient, because while it was an appropriation act still there was legislation on it, and the provision with respect to the solicitor was not limited to that particular year, but contained the word "hereafter."

The Chair reads from section 3687 of Hinds' Precedents, volume 4:

In the absence of a general law fixing a salary the amount appropriated in the last appropriation bill has been held to be the legal salary, although in violation of the general rule that the appropriation bill makes law only for the year.

If this position had been created by a separate and distinct statute establishing the position and fixing a definite salary for it, that salary would govern, and if a committee in the preparation of an appropriation bill should increase the salary or the allowance for that salary at any subsequent time and a point of order should be made against it, the point of order would be good. But as the Chair understands the language of the appropriation act of 1910, it did not attempt to fix a definite salary for the position of solicitor, and under the precedent that the Chair has cited, inasmuch as Congress in its last appropriation bill fixed the salary at \$5,000, it is the opinion of the Chair that that would be the law with respect to the salary, and, therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the Chair that it has been repeatedly held that where a salary has been carried in an appropriation bill without specific law therefor, it

does not fix the salary at all, and that the one objecting to the salary may go back to the time when the office was first created and date from the salary fixed at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that would be true if there existed some specific, separate statute that created that position and fixed a certain definite salary for it, but as the Chair understands the situation that condition does not prevail. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, as to the chief clerk, there is an effort to change his salary from a fixed law of \$2,000 to \$3,500. I make the point of order against the salary of the chief clerk. In the creation of the Department of Agriculture there was a provision for one chief clerk at a salary of \$2,000. The revision of the statute has gone on from time to time up to 1874, and has on each occasion in the revision carried a salary of \$2,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. A point of order was pending against the salary of the solicitor, which the Chair overruled. After the Chair had rendered his decision upon that question the gentleman from Illinois began to argue upon the same question, and after he had argued for a moment or two he made another point of order against the salary of the chief clerk of the department. I make the point of order that he can not raise a point of order after a discussion has been had upon the question.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a point of order in the first instance against the entire paragraph, as the record will show.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order of the gentleman is in order.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct in that, and I would like to answer his point of order on the salary of the clerk. That has been carried for the last 10 years in the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Virginia a question. Was provision made for a chief clerk in the general law?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman; and I have that law before me. I read now from the Revised Statutes of the United States, section 521:

The Department of Agriculture shall be under the charge of a Commissioner of Agriculture, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be entitled, etc. There shall be one chief clerk at a salary of \$2,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Virginia if there has been any change by law in the amount of that salary?

Mr. LAMB. It has been carried in the appropriation bill for the last 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman understands that where there is a law fixing a definite amount for a salary, the mere fact that it has been carried at a different sum in an appropriation bill will not sustain it if a point of order is made against it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the \$500 additional as the custodian of the building is subject to a point of order, but the \$3,000, of course, is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from South Carolina refer the Chair to any statute changing the salary of this chief clerk?

Mr. LEVER. No; I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina know that there has been such a change?

Mr. LEVER. No; the gentleman does not know that.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the attention of the Chair is directed to a change in the law increasing the salary [a pause] the point of order is sustained.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order now against "one special agent on exhibits, \$3,000."

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order and let me give an explanation which will satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. LAMB. This is a new place, I admit. There is need of an employee to care for and prepare the department's exhibit for national and international expositions and for State fairs. A man not only possessing executive ability but also trained professionally as an agrostologist is required in this instance. It was necessary to offer the salary indicated to retain the services of such an employee. The salary of the official now performing these duties is met by several bureaus. They have had this agent all the while and it has been divided between the

Bureaus of Animal Industry, Forestry, Chemistry, and the Secretary's office, and they together have paid this man's salary. Now that is consolidated in the office of the Secretary, and the salary of this new official now performing these duties is paid by the Secretary's office under this appropriation instead of by these other three.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, in other words it is not a new place; it is simply a change of title. It changes the title from that of agrostologist.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard upon the point of order. This is a new place, and yet a new place authorized by law. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to section 523, which has already been read to the Chair, in which the Commissioner of Agriculture is authorized, as Congress may from time to time provide, to employ employees with salaries of similar offices in other departments of the Government; and he shall, as Congress may from time to time provide, employ other persons for such time as their services may be needed, and in addition to that I would like to call the attention of the Chair to section 169 of the Revised Statutes:

Each head of a department is authorized to employ in his department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law, or such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees, and at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

The Chair has uniformly held on that proposition that Congress had the right under section 169 of the Revised Statutes to employ men to do the work in the various executive departments of the Government. I might cite the Chair to a ruling on December 6, 1912, third session Sixty-second Congress, where Chairman GARNER ruled as follows:

It seems to the Chair that the first question for the Chair to ascertain is whether or not section 169 of the Revised Statutes authorizes these clerks or whether or not the head of a department has the right to employ those five clerks. In 1906 Mr. Hull of Iowa was in the chair, and this identical question came up and was decided by him on a point of order made by Mr. Tawney upon clerks of a similar nature in the War Department. Mr. Hull held at that time, quoting section 169, that where the statute had authorized the heads of departments to employ clerks and other laborers, that it was in order, and he overruled the point of order. He used this language:

"The first question is, What law authorizes this appropriation? The only law referred to is that contained in section 169 of the Revised Statutes, which is as follows:"

Here he quotes the statute. This is a similar case, where the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] cites the statute, 169, as authority for this legislation.

It has been held time and time again, Mr. Chairman, that under the broad language of section 169 the heads of the various executive departments of the Government have the right to employ such number of clerks and other employees as Congress may from time to time provide. I therefore contend that this provision is not subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the precedents are almost uniform to the effect that, under the authority of the act creating the Department of Agriculture, as well as under the authority of the article of the statute which has been read here, it is within the province of this committee to consider any item on an appropriation bill to create and care for such an employee as this, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I move that the secretary be authorized to correct the totals.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to the fact that in this first paragraph there is no appropriation made for a chief clerk at all.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, that is what I want recognition for now.

I desire to amend this paragraph, page 2, lines 1 and 2, by inserting in place of that which is stricken out:

Chief clerk, \$2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 2, by inserting "\$2,000."

Mr. FOWLER. So that it will read:

Chief clerk, \$2,000; private secretary of the Secretary of Agriculture—

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I ask that the amendment be reported again, and I ask also for order. It is absolutely impossible to hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, insert "\$2,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that by making it \$3,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] fixing the salary of the chief clerk at \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Weather Bureau: One chief of bureau, \$6,000; 1 assistant chief of bureau, \$3,250; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, \$3,000; 1 chief of printing division, \$2,500; 2 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; 8 clerks, class 4; 9 clerks, class 3; 21 clerks, class 2; 30 clerks, class 1; 22 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 9 clerks, at \$900 each; 5 copyists or typewriters, at \$900 each; 1 telegraph operator, \$1,200; 2 assistant foremen of division, at \$1,600 each; 1 lithographer, \$1,500; 3 lithographers, at \$1,200 each; 6 compositors, at \$1,250 each; 14 printers, at \$1,200 each; 11 printers, at \$1,000 each; 4 folders and feeders, at \$720 each; 1 chief mechanic, \$1,400; 5 skilled mechanics, at \$1,200 each; 7 skilled mechanics, at \$1,000 each; 1 skilled mechanic, \$840; 1 skilled mechanic, \$720; 6 skilled artisans, at \$840 each; 1 engineer, \$1,300; 1 fireman and steam fitter, \$840; 6 firemen, at \$720 each; 1 captain of the watch, \$1,000; 1 electrician, \$1,200; 1 gardener, \$840; 2 repairmen, at \$840 each; 8 repairmen, at \$720 each; 4 watchmen, at \$720 each; 17 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$660 each; 27 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 87 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$480 each; 5 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$450 each; 27 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 charwoman, \$360; 3 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$323,260.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. I make the point of order against the salary of the chief of bureau, \$6,000, and also one assistant chief of bureau at \$3,250, and one chief clerk at \$3,000, and also one chief of printing division, \$2,500.

Mr. Chairman, in 1891 there was a permanent act passed, on March 3 of that year, creating the Chief of the Weather Bureau at a salary of \$4,500. I desire to make a point of order against the Chief of the Weather Bureau at the salary of \$6,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Illinois the statute at hand?

Mr. FOWLER. I have reference to the act of March 3, 1891, \$4,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] if he knows there has been any change in that salary as fixed in the act of 1891?

Mr. LAMB. Not a thing that I know of. I do not think so.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to have the gentleman from Illinois read the act.

Mr. LAMB. Section 4 uses this language:

That the Weather Bureau shall hereafter consist of one Chief of Weather Bureau and such civilian employees as Congress may annually provide for and as may be necessary to properly perform the duties devolving upon said bureau by law, and the chief of said bureau shall receive an annual compensation and be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that act?

Mr. LAMB. It does not give the date. It is Twenty-sixth Statutes at Large, section 653.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I will state that I made a thorough investigation of the statute last night and this morning, in connection with the librarian, and we were unable to find any section which changed the salary from \$4,500.

Mr. LAMB. It does not fix any salary.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from Illinois refer the Chairman to the law that fixes the salary of this officer to \$4,500?

Mr. FOWLER. It creates a salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, and fixes the salary of four captains and four lieutenants. I am reading my notes as taken from the statute.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman read from the statute?

Mr. FOWLER. It is the act of March 3, 1891, creating a Chief of the Weather Bureau and his assistants.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt in the minds of the gentlemen of the committee or the Chair, I am perfectly willing that this point should be passed with the point of order pending.

Mr. LAMB. What is the request of the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair understand the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. I say, Mr. Chairman, that if there is any doubt about the permanent law, as I have indicated, I am perfectly willing to let the point of order be passed and be considered as pending until gentlemen of the committee can satisfy themselves.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman to what his point of order is directed? How far does it go?

Mr. FOWLER. I think I shall confine it only to the salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, although there are many other changes.

Mr. MANN. Is that the request of the gentleman—that the point of order as to the salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau be passed over temporarily, the other points of order not being pressed?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I accept that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] with respect to the particular item of the Chief of the Weather Bureau is that it be passed over temporarily, and that the other points of order reserved by him are withdrawn.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses, Weather Bureau: For fuel, lights, repairs, and other expenses for the care and preservation of the public buildings and grounds and the improvement of the existing public buildings of the Weather Bureau in the city of Washington; for stationery and blank books, furniture and repairs to same, and freight and express charges; for subsistence, care, and purchase of horses and vehicles, and repairs of harness, for official purposes only; for advertising, dry goods, twine, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, washing towels, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for in the city of Washington, \$25,000.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question. I see the total carried by the bill this year is \$17,593,275. How does this compare with the last year's bill of a similar nature?

Mr. MANN. This is an increase of about \$900,000 over the bill of last year.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Weather Bureau: For carrying into effect in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States, in the West Indies or on adjacent coasts, in the Hawaiian Islands, and in Bermuda, the provisions of an act approved October 1, 1890, so far as they relate to the weather service transferred thereby to the Department of Agriculture, and for every expenditure requisite for and incident to the establishment, equipment, and maintenance of meteorological observation stations, including cooperation with other bureaus of the Government and societies and institutions of learning for the dissemination of meteorological information, as follows:

For the employment of professors of meteorology, inspectors, district forecasters, local forecasters, section directors, research observers, observers, assistant observers, operators, skilled mechanics, repairmen, station agents, messengers, messenger boys, laborers, and other necessary employees, \$585,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Gentlemen will notice that in the paragraph just read provision is made for the weather service, based partly upon observations in the United States, in the West Indies or adjacent coasts, in the Hawaiian Islands, and in Bermuda.

We have had our attention called in recent days to Bermuda, and for the first time in the history of the country we, probably, most of us, have learned some notion with reference to where Bermuda is. This side of the House, the Republican side of the House, has come to have great respect for Bermuda [applause], and I dare say we have learned enough about it to have learned how to spell it. But it seems the Democratic side of the House has so little interest in Bermuda and in the gentleman who has been sojourning there that they have not even learned how the word is spelled. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, it was a Republican printer who did that. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANN. It was a Republican printer who knew how to follow copy, and it was a Democratic committee that did not know how to spell the word in preparing the copy. [Laughter.]

I waited until after the item had been passed in the House, with no suggestion coming from the Democratic side of the House to change the spelling, because they had not yet learned how Bermuda is spelled. When Bermuda attracted their attention in the prints, they did not notice the word; they were so engaged in hoping that the gentleman then sojourning in Bermuda would provide jobs for them hereafter that they forgot how it was spelled. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAMB. It is to be hoped, Mr. Chairman, that when the Democrats have had the experience that the Republicans have had they will not only be better spellers, but they will be able to do other things better, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Well, it is to be hoped that they will be better spellers, at least.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. In a moment. I can not yield now. I hope that some one will learn that they have spelled Bermuda "B-u-r-

m-u-d-a," and it has passed the House that way, although now—

Mr. HAWLEY. Let the Senate amend it—

Mr. MANN. Having learned that this is spelled wrong in the bill, the gentlemen can send out and get a gazetteer and learn how it is spelled, or the Republican Senate can do what they have often had to do before—correct it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. If the gentlemen of the House desire to know how "Bermuda" is spelled, they can undoubtedly find out by referring to the tariff hearings, because I believe that for the second time in the history of the United States Government representatives both of Bermuda and of the Bahamas—foreign countries—instead of coming before the State Department, have come now directly, as they came at the time of the hearings on the Wilson bill, from their own parliaments to a committee of the House of Representatives to advocate their interests in the tariff revision, and in the tariff hearings gentlemen will find the spelling both as to Bermuda and the Bahamas. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I object to having my last two words stricken out. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will make it three. I wanted to suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] that if these gentlemen that he has referred to have been before the Committee on Ways and Means their evidence is in print, and the whole world can know what they have said to the committee. In former times, however, when the gentleman's party was revising the tariff, secret meetings were held and these men were able to fix up a tariff bill to suit themselves.

And so if the Democrats have done what the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] now sees fit to find fault with, it has been done in the open and in public. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I want to say that I refer my friend from Connecticut to the transaction that took place in another body as recorded and stated by the late Senator from Iowa, Mr. Dolliver, when he made some remarks upon the bill in the Senate.

Mr. HILL. I want to refer the gentleman, in answer to his own statement, to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] in the last session, in which he stated, in regard to the manner of making up the bills which were then pending, that nearly a thousand private interviews had been given. [Applause on the Republican side.] At the same time public hearings with reference to these pending bills were absolutely refused.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but the difference between the two is this: That the private hearings before the Democratic committee were not written into the bill, but it is shown that the private hearings before the Republican committee resulted in the writing of a part of the Republican bill by men who were doing it in the interest of their own pockets. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Did anybody ever charge the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] with having taken a very active part in any of those matters?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether they have or not.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I must insist that this discussion is out of order, as the time of the gentleman has expired, and I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the acquisition of sites outside of the District of Columbia and the erection thereon of two buildings for use as Weather Bureau observatories, to be constructed under the supervision of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, plans and specifications to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for all necessary labor, materials, and expenses connected with this work, \$40,000.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee about the meaning of the language on the top of page 7:

For the acquisition of sites outside of the District of Columbia.

Does that mean anywhere in the world outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. LAMB. It is for the erection of additional Weather Bureau observatories outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. COOPER. But where outside of the District of Columbia? Those words might mean anywhere in the world.

Mr. LAMB. Wherever the Secretary of Agriculture or the Weather Bureau shall conclude to erect the buildings, at the most advantageous places. There are 8 or 10 places in com-

petition. From the evidence before our committee it seems as if five or six were needed, but we did not think that at this session of Congress we could create more than two.

Mr. COOPER. Where are those to be?

Mr. LAMB. It is not decided positively, but we think, perhaps, the most important are Sandy Hook, N. Y., and Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I ask to return to line 9, page 5, to correct the spelling of the word "Bermuda." It is spelled in the bill with a "u" in the first syllable and it should be an "e."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Clerk will make the correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

And hereafter officials and employees of the Weather Bureau may be transferred from the field service to service in the same bureau in the District of Columbia without regard to the civil-service rule of apportionment; and officials and employees of the Weather Bureau, when transferred from one station to another for official duty, shall be allowed all traveling expenses authorized by existing laws applicable to said bureau, notwithstanding any changes in appointments that may be required by such transfers.

Mr. COX. I reserve a point of order on that. I think it is rather peculiar.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, let me explain. This paragraph has been inserted to cover the exchange of employees between the city of Washington and the field, and the payment of traveling expenses of employees transferred from one station to another. The work carried on by the Weather Bureau is of such a character as to render it desirable that its officials and employees at the central office be fully familiar with the work performed at the field stations, and vice versa. Under the application of existing civil-service rules there is no difficulty about transferring employees from the city of Washington to the field, but under existing laws and regulations the transfer from the field force to the city of Washington is rendered difficult and is often impossible. Under the present ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury an employee transferred from one State to another with either promotion or reduction in salary, or whose status or designation is changed without any change in salary, can not be paid his traveling expenses after the new appointment is issued to him, as such appointment is held to create a new position, and the employee is required to report for duty at his new station without expense to the Government. Changes in salary or status are often necessary incidents to the transfer of employees from one State to another, and the application of this ruling is highly embarrassing to the official administration of the bureau. The proposed paragraph will be a great gain toward efficiency in the operation of the Weather Bureau. I think that explanation, which is the one furnished by the department, ought to be satisfactory to my friend.

Mr. COX. The sum and substance of the whole matter is that you propose to change and completely break down the law governing the civil service without regard to the rules of apportionment. That will be the effect of it; it simply destroys the whole apportionment now existing under the civil-service law. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. LAMB. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Chair will call attention to section 4 of chapter 1266 of the laws of 1890, which reads as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Weather Bureau shall hereafter consist of one chief of the Weather Bureau and such civilian employees as Congress may annually provide for and as may be necessary to properly perform the duties devolving on said bureau by law, and the chief of said bureau shall receive an annual compensation of \$4,500, and be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Unless the gentleman from Virginia or some other gentleman can show that there has been some amendment of this statute, the Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. LEVER. As far as I have been able to examine, Mr. Chairman, I have no law except the current appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment making the salary \$4,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 3, by inserting after the word "bureau," in line 16, the figures "\$4,500."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,500; 1 editor and compiler, \$2,250; 6 clerks, class 4; 1 clerk, \$1,680; 12 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at \$1,500 each; 22 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at \$1,380 each; 3 clerks, at \$1,320 each; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 1 clerk, \$1,260; 39 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,100; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 50 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 2 clerks, at \$960 each; 64 clerks, at

\$900 each; 1 architect, \$2,000; 1 architect, \$900; 1 illustrator, \$1,400; 4 inspector's assistants, at \$1,000 each; 12 inspector's assistants, at \$840 each; 1 laboratory assistant, \$1,200; 2 laboratory assistants, at \$900 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$1,020; 2 laboratory helpers, at \$840 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$720; 1 laboratory helper, \$600; 1 laboratory helper, \$480; 1 instrument maker, \$1,200; 1 carpenter, \$1,100; 2 carpenters, at \$1,000 each; 1 messenger and custodian, \$1,200; 1 messenger and custodian, \$1,000; 9 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at \$840 each; 10 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at \$720 each; 23 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$480 each; 6 messengers or messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 33 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 7 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; 1 skilled laborer or laborer, \$780; 2 laborers or messengers, at \$660 each; 9 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at \$600 each; 3 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at \$540 each; 1 watchman, \$720; 1 charwoman, \$600; 1 charwoman, \$540; 11 charwomen, at \$480 each; 4 charwomen, at \$360 each; 1 charwoman, \$300; 2 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$359,250.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. The salary of the chief of bureau is fixed at \$5,000, which is an attempt to change existing law. Also the salary of one chief clerk at \$2,500, which is another effort to change existing law. The act of May 29, 1884, created a chief of this bureau at a salary of \$3,000 and a chief clerk at a salary of \$1,500. The act of 1889, after the Agriculture Department was put under the head of a Secretary, carried these salaries, to wit: One chief, at a salary of \$3,000, and one chief clerk, at a salary of \$1,500. I submit the statute, Mr. Chairman, as to the correctness of my statement.

Mr. LAMB. The same law applies as to all the others.

Mr. FOWLER. The act of February 2, 1889, carries the same provision.

Mr. LAMB. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LAMB. I will offer amendments restoring the old salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 7, line 21, by inserting, after the word "bureau," the figures "\$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 7, line 21, by inserting, after the word "clerk," the figures "\$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inspection and quarantine work, including all necessary expenses for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of live stock and the inspection of vessels, the execution of the 28-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals, including the establishment and maintenance of quarantine stations and the alteration of buildings thereon, the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases and the tuberculin and mallein testing of animals, \$620,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 12, page 11, the figures "\$620,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$820,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the item that follows this one reads:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, \$325,000.

According to the testimony of Dr. Melvin the total loss last year by cattle in the United States from this disease, by depreciation through sickness and loss, was in the neighborhood of \$25,000 or \$40,000; and this committee proposes to appropriate \$325,000 to eradicate this disease.

Mr. LAMB. If the gentleman will allow me, I think he has dropped a figure. I think he means two hundred and fifty or three hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. GOOD. I call attention to the testimony before the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. Last year the total loss in the United States, according to the testimony of Dr. Melvin, of hogs by cholera was to the value of \$42,042,000; yet there is not a single penny appropriated in this bill for the prevention and eradication of hog cholera. I have read with deepest interest the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture with regard to the efforts of the department to prevent and eradicate hog cholera and to stamp out that disease. I was amazed to find that while, according to the testimony of Dr. Melvin, there is a perfect serum which will absolutely prevent hog cholera, not a single penny is here appropriated to prevent or to stamp out this disease. Dr. Melvin testified before that committee as follows:

Mr. SLOAN. What, if any, appropriation is there that could be used in extending and increasing these demonstrations? Is there any such fund as that?

Dr. MELVIN. There is a fund, but the estimates as submitted to the committee were only sufficient to provide for work which we now have on hand and not for increasing this demonstration work. We would not be able to conduct or increase this demonstration work without a considerable increase in those funds.

Mr. SLOAN. If an increase in appropriations should be made, is your bureau so organized that it has or could have available competent men who could be sent to different points in the several States to make these demonstrations?

Dr. MELVIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. If such funds were provided and such competent persons sent, in your opinion would it be wisely spent money looking toward the reduction of this very large annual loss which you have recited to the committee?

Dr. MELVIN. I think undoubtedly it would. I think that if we were provided with funds, so we go into several States and take up a considerable section, involving three or four counties in a block, and there demonstrate that losses from cholera need not necessarily exist, that it would be of immense value to the country. I think we could demonstrate to the States that by careful organization and the use of an efficient serum that the cholera could be reduced to a minimum and probably eventually eradicated.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, I am interested to know if there is other testimony corroborative of that of Dr. Melvin which goes to show that this serum really cures or prevents hog cholera. I am interested to know.

Mr. GOOD. I think Dr. Dorsett's testimony corroborates that of Dr. Melvin. I understand that there are men outside of this chamber who do not want a single penny expended by the Government to prevent hog cholera. While there were \$42,000,000 worth of hogs lost last year by cholera, that does not measure the loss to the farmers. I suppose the farmers who raise hogs expended \$10,000,000 more in buying patent medicines that were useless, and the patent-medicine manufacturers do not want a single penny appropriated that this disease may be effectually stamped out. If we are going to do something for the farmers of States like Illinois, where they lost last year \$8,000,000 because of hog cholera; of States like Iowa, where they lost \$7,000,000 through cholera, we ought to begin now. I can appreciate that some of the gentlemen on that side are not interested in these matters, and why? Let us take the State of Virginia, for instance. If my recollection serves me right, only 3.6 per cent of the hogs of Virginia were lost by cholera, while in Illinois 20 per cent were lost by cholera.

Mr. LAMB. Oh, the State of Virginia takes better care of its hogs.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; hog cholera could never overtake one of those razorbacks. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, it looks as though a personal explanation would be good at this point. I will state that I lost 200 hogs on one farm—Berkshires, and not razorbacks.

Mr. MANN. That is because the gentleman raises good hogs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, in no spirit of controversy, I would like to know if the gentleman does not concede that the serum for the hog-cholera cure is still in a very experimental stage.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will concede that it is no more in experimental stage than is the cure for southern cattle ticks in an experimental stage, and I will refer the gentleman from New York [Mr. KINDRED] to the page of the hearings with regard to the loss by cattle ticks. On page 8, Dr. Melvin says that the loss through cattle-tick fever has been variously estimated at from twenty-five to forty million dollars, while the loss from hog cholera last year was \$42,000,000. I hope the gentleman who is chairman of this great committee will be as generous to the raisers of hogs as he is to the raisers of southern cattle in this regard. If he wants to do something to reduce the high cost of living, let him appropriate a small sum—a mere drop in the bucket as compared with the great loss in the country—in order that we may prevent this great loss of live stock by hog cholera.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks the statement of Dr. Melvin with regard to the loss of hogs by cholera and the results of the experiments in treating hogs with this anticholera serum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including a part of the hearings referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Estimate of losses from hog cholera for the year ending Mar. 31, 1912.

[Based on data compiled by Bureau of Statistics, Department of Agriculture.]

State.	Number hogs estimated in State Jan. 1, 1912.	Number of hogs lost by hog cholera.	Percentage lost due to hog cholera.	Total value hogs in State Jan. 1, 1912.	Value of hogs lost by hog cholera.
Maine.....	101,000	1,363	1.35	\$1,162,000	\$15,700
New Hampshire.....	53,000	954	1.80	556,000	10,000
Vermont.....	111,000	3,996	3.60	1,110,000	40,000
Massachusetts.....	117,000	3,685	3.15	1,322,000	45,000
Rhode Island.....	16,000	259	1.61	192,000	3,100
Connecticut.....	60,000	2,592	4.32	696,000	30,700
New York.....	777,000	20,279	2.61	7,925,000	206,900
New Jersey.....	165,000	5,940	3.60	1,864,000	67,100
Pennsylvania.....	1,141,000	37,995	3.33	11,410,000	380,000
Delaware.....	59,000	4,043	6.74	435,000	29,200
Maryland.....	345,000	23,284	6.74	2,760,000	186,300
Virginia.....	880,000	31,680	3.60	5,444,000	199,600
West Virginia.....	363,000	13,394	3.69	2,432,000	89,600
North Carolina.....	1,465,000	55,638	3.96	10,397,000	401,700
South Carolina.....	797,000	43,033	5.40	6,376,000	244,300
Georgia.....	2,098,000	109,938	5.24	14,057,000	1,138,000
Florida.....	954,000	85,800	9.00	4,961,000	446,500
Ohio.....	3,578,000	225,414	6.30	29,340,000	1,848,400
Indiana.....	4,061,000	453,487	11.25	31,039,000	3,491,900
Illinois.....	4,540,000	897,840	20.35	40,832,000	7,901,000
Michigan.....	1,382,000	49,732	3.60	11,747,000	422,800
Wisconsin.....	2,051,000	51,686	2.52	19,600,000	496,200
Minnesota.....	1,702,000	47,440	2.79	17,701,000	483,400
Iowa.....	9,689,000	697,708	7.20	94,952,000	6,837,000
Missouri.....	4,491,000	646,704	14.40	31,437,000	4,527,000
North Dakota.....	359,000	4,846	1.35	3,770,000	50,900
South Dakota.....	1,104,000	37,756	3.42	9,836,000	336,000
Nebraska.....	4,267,000	230,418	5.40	37,550,000	2,027,700
Kansas.....	2,808,000	333,590	11.88	22,183,000	2,635,300
Kentucky.....	1,724,000	108,612	6.30	9,310,000	586,500
Tennessee.....	1,574,000	99,162	6.30	9,601,000	604,900
Alabama.....	1,533,000	89,680	5.85	9,964,000	553,000
Mississippi.....	1,577,000	106,447	6.75	10,250,000	692,000
Louisiana.....	1,642,000	147,780	9.00	9,524,000	857,100
Texas.....	2,544,000	77,846	3.06	16,027,000	485,500
Oklahoma.....	1,410,000	184,005	13.05	7,755,000	1,012,000
Arkansas.....	1,738,000	218,988	12.60	9,385,000	1,182,500
Montana.....	143,000	2,445	1.70	1,416,000	24,200
Wyoming.....	43,000	464	1.08	370,000	3,900
Colorado.....	211,000	3,798	1.80	1,688,000	30,400
New Mexico.....	50,000	720	1.44	410,000	5,900
Arizona.....	22,000	237	1.08	231,000	2,500
Utah.....	79,000	1,137	1.44	711,000	10,200
Nevada.....	30,000	648	2.16	315,000	6,800
Idaho.....	212,000	2,671	1.25	1,696,000	21,300
Washington.....	246,000	4,870	1.98	2,337,000	46,200
Oregon.....	258,000	3,715	1.40	2,193,000	31,500
California.....	830,000	18,675	2.25	6,889,000	155,000
United States.....	65,410,000	5,251,010	8.02	523,328,000	42,042,900

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1913.

PARTIAL SUMMARY OF RESULTS OBTAINED FROM APPLICATION OF BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY'S ANTICHOLERA SERUM.

[All animals were kept under ordinary farm conditions.]

October 19, 1908 (Michigan): Infected herd. When visited 1 hog had died, 7 were sick, and 21 apparently well. Treated, 23 (3 of which were sick). Untreated, 5.

Results: Treated, survived, 22 or approximately 96 per cent; untreated, survived, none.

October 20, 1908 (Michigan): Herd slightly infected. Treated, 11; untreated, 4.

Results: Treated, all remained well; untreated, all died.

July 15, 1909 (Maryland): Experiment. Owner had lost nearly all of his herd. He bought 11 pigs and agreed to have some of these treated by the serum simultaneous method and others inoculated with virus alone to serve as checks. Treated, 7; virus alone, 3.

Results: All treated animals remained well; all virus-alone animals died.

August 25, 1909 (Virginia): Data incomplete on account of remoteness of the herd, but reported that all treated animals remained well, while all untreated ones died.

September 15, 1909 (Virginia): Data incomplete. All treated animals remained well; all untreated animals died.

December 6, 1909 (Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station): Herd infected. Treated 43, many of which were sick; untreated, none.

Results: Survived, 29, or approximately 68 per cent; died, 14, or approximately 32 per cent.

December 21-22, 1909 (Virginia): Herd very badly infected. About 35 animals had died, and practically all of the survivors were showing symptoms of hog cholera to a greater or less degree. Treated, 113, many of which were sick; untreated, 179.

Results: Treated, survived, 79, or approximately 69.91 per cent; treated, died, 34, or approximately 30 per cent; untreated, survived, 111, or approximately 62 per cent; untreated, died, 68, or approximately 38 per cent.

This data is incomplete, as at last report some of the untreated animals were said to have been "looking badly."

February 18, 1910 (West Virginia Hospital for Insane): Herd infected. Treated, 47 (many of which showed early symptoms of disease); untreated, 52.

Results: Treated, survived, 36, or approximately 76 per cent; treated, died, 11, or approximately 24 per cent; untreated, died, 52, or 100 per cent.

April 16, 1910 (Maryland): Disease just beginning. Treated, 34; untreated, 16.

Results: Final report stated that all treated animals remained well. No mention was made as to the untreated ones.

April 16, 1910 (second herd, Maryland): Data incomplete; no detailed final report. Only the general statement received that all treated animals remained well.

July 9, 1910 (Iowa): Owner had lost the greater portion of his herd and had procured 14 pigs from one of his neighbors for this experiment. The simultaneous method was employed. Treated by, 11; virus alone, 3.

Results: Treated, survived, 8 or approximately 73 per cent; treated, died, 3, or approximately 27 per cent. All virus-alone animals died.

July 21, 1910 (Nebraska): Infected herd. Data incomplete. The final report was to the effect that nearly all treated animals survived. No statement as to the untreated ones.

November 12, 1910 (Washington, D. C. jail): Herd badly infected. Treated, 18; untreated, exact number not known.

Results: Treated, survived, 14, or approximately 78 per cent; treated, died, 4 or approximately 22 per cent; untreated, no exact data. Received only the statement that all untreated animals died.

December 2, 1910 (Maryland): Disease just beginning; 4 animals had died. Treated, 82; untreated, 34.

Results: Treated, survived, 73, or approximately 90 per cent; treated, died, 9, or approximately 10 per cent.

(The report on the untreated hogs is incomplete, but as near as could be determined 73 per cent died and 27 per cent survived.)

March 3, 1911 (Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station): Herd slightly infected. Treated, 42 (3 of which showed the early symptoms of hog cholera); untreated, none.

Results: Treated, survived, 41, or approximately 98 per cent; treated, died, 1, or approximately 2 per cent. (This animal was one of those which were sick when treated.)

March 16, 1911 (Virginia): Herd badly infected. Treated, 24; untreated, 9.

Results: Treated, survived, 18, or 75 per cent; treated, died, 6, or 25 per cent; untreated, died, 9, or 100 per cent.

December 20, 1911 (North Carolina): Herd not infected. Treated, 4; untreated, none.

Results: All animals remained well.

December 8, 1911 (Virginia): Herd infected. Treated, 8; untreated, 4.

Results: Treated, survived, 6, or 75 per cent; treated, died, 2, or 25 per cent; untreated, survived, 1, or 25 per cent; untreated, died, 3, or 75 per cent.

December —, 1911 (Maryland): Herd badly infected. Approximately 200 hogs had died. This herd is a very valuable one, being composed of pure-bred Duroc-Jerseys. Treated, 6; untreated, approximately 40.

Results: All treated animals survived. No accurate figures given as to the untreated animals, only the general statement was received that "a large number had died."

January 2, 1913 (Bureau of Animal Industry, Division of Animal Husbandry): Healthy herd, and was treated by the serum simultaneous method. Treated, 60; untreated, none.

Results: All animals remained well.

January 22, 1912 (Maryland): Herd infected. One animal had died and 3 were sick. Treated, 5 (3 of which were sick when treated). Untreated, none.

Results: Three, or 60 per cent, of these animals died (sick when treated); 2, or 40 per cent, of these animals survived (well when treated).

January 25, 1912 (Columbia Hospital for Deaf): Herd badly infected. Treated, 4. Number of untreated animals could not be ascertained.

Results: All treated animals survived. Reliable data concerning the untreated ones could not be obtained.

January 26, 1912 (Fort Hunt, Va.): Herd infected. Treated, 14; untreated, 18.

Results: Treated, survived, 13, or approximately 93 per cent; died, 1, or approximately 7 per cent. Untreated, survived, 8, or approximately 45 per cent; died, 10, or approximately 55 per cent.

February 27 and April 20, 1912 (Government Hospital for Insane, District of Columbia): This herd was infected and kept under poor hygienic conditions. Treated, 120; untreated, 44.

Results: Treated, survived, 118, or approximately 98 per cent; died, 2, or approximately 2 per cent. Untreated—no exact figures could be ascertained concerning these hogs, but the asylum veterinarian placed it at approximately 90 per cent.

November —, 1912 (Iowa Agricultural College): Disease just beginning. One or two hogs not eating well. Treated, 24; untreated, 3.

Results: Treated, survived, 24; untreated, died, 3.

December 14, 1912 (Virginia): Herd infected. Treated, 4; untreated, 4.

Results: Treated, survived, 4, or 100 per cent; untreated, survived, 1, or 25 per cent; untreated, died, 3, or 75 per cent.

July, 1908, Kansas City, Kans. Experiment. Thirty-five young shoats were purchased from a farm where hog cholera had not existed. These pigs, having been carried to the Kansas City stockyards, and being in charge of a committee appointed by the exchange, were treated as follows: Twenty-two were injected with anti-hog-cholera serum prepared by the bureau. Four were injected with virulent hog-cholera blood. Nine were not treated in any manner. All were placed in a pen together. As was expected, the 4 pigs inoculated with the virulent blood contracted hog cholera within a short time and all died. The 9 "checks" contracted hog cholera from those which were inoculated with hog-cholera blood, and they also died. The 22 pigs treated with the serum remained well, with the exception of one or two, which were slightly affected on one or two days. It is not certain, however, that the trouble with the treated hogs was hog cholera, as none died. All of the autopsies on the check animals showed typical lesions of hog cholera.

August, 1910 (South Omaha, Nebr.): Experiment. This experiment was undertaken at the request of State officials and the Nebraska Swine Breeders' Association. The Union Stock Yards Co., of South Omaha, also offered to cooperate and to bear the expense incident to the purchase and care of hogs used in the experiment. Thirty pigs, weighing from 40 to 60 pounds, were purchased from a farm which had been free from hog cholera for several years. These hogs were carried to the stockyards and, on July 23, 1910, four of them were injected with blood from hogs sick of hog cholera. These injected pigs, which were placed in a pen by themselves, became sick on the 28th of July, at which time 18 of the remaining pigs were given one dose of the serum, while the other 8 pigs were not treated in any way. The 18 serum-treated pigs and the 8 untreated pigs were then placed in the same pen with the 4

pigs which had been made sick of hog cholera. The four pigs which were inoculated with hog cholera all died. The eight untreated check pigs all contracted hog cholera from the four inoculated ones. The 18 pigs which were given serum and which were confined in the same pen with the 4 original sick pigs and with the 8 untreated pigs, which became sick, remained perfectly well and were finally turned over to the officials of the stockyards company upon the completion of the experiment on September 17, 1910.

In conclusion, the total number of hogs treated by both the serum alone and the serum-simultaneous methods in the above demonstrations was 744, of which 613, or approximately 82 per cent, survived, while of the untreated hogs, which numbered 362, 228, or approximately 63 per cent, died. The figures given showing the percentage of the untreated animals which died are not absolutely correct in that in the case of two herds the report was to the effect that a large number of untreated hogs died, while in four herds it was reported that all untreated animals died. As we had no definite data as to the number of untreated animals in these herds, they were not considered in figuring the percentage.

NOTE.—In addition to the above-described demonstration experiments, a number of similar experiments have been carried out; but the records of these tests are not immediately available. If the committee desires, they will be secured and furnished later.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Before I commence to speak upon this amendment I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] to the fact that his own State has only spent \$2,500, according to the official statement upon page 29 of the hearings, in attempting to control hog cholera. While the States of the Union are spending \$200,000 annually in combating hog cholera the great State of Iowa has spent only the amount of \$2,500 during the past year. Now that is a fact, gentlemen—

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. GOOD. In making these appropriations is it the theory that the States are to expend the money for eradicating and preventing this disease?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I will come to that in a moment. I want to emphasize the fact that while other States of the Union are spending \$200,000 that Iowa is only spending \$2,500. Now, hog cholera comes under the class of diseases for which the United States Government has worked out a formula. This formula has been patented by Dr. Dorsett and given for the free use of our people. Serum is not claimed to be a cure of hog cholera but a preventive, and having worked out this formula, they have turned it over to the States of the Union and they have asked State authorities to apply it in each individual case. This is precisely what the National Government ought to do. The National Government having perfected what it claims to be an absolute preventive of hog cholera, the National Government called in all the experiment stations of the different States of the Union and gave public demonstration of how to produce the serum and how to apply it properly. They then gave this important work over to the different States of the Union. In taking this action the National Government has in a very proper way proceeded to the carrying of applied science to the agricultural sections of the United States. I am glad to see the new interest in this project, and I claim some credit for my committee that we have given through our hearings the information which has stimulated this activity on this floor to-day. The real ground for complaint is that the Department of Agriculture has never yet given sufficient public demonstrations to prove conclusively the fact that serum is a hog cholera preventive. That is the only question to be demonstrated. They have made only two public demonstrations, one involving the use of only 30 hogs and the other the use of only 35 hogs during these years since 1906. It is not sufficient proof to rest the reputation of this remedy on two public demonstrations using only 65 hogs. We have had this remedy since 1906, and the fact is that the loss by hog cholera has not diminished but has actually increased. Now this creates a legitimate field for valuable demonstration work; it is a call to the Agricultural Department to go out among the farmers and to the different States and demonstrate the efficacy of this remedy; to prove whether the States are or are not carrying out the work in the proper manner and whether the serum is or is not a reliable preventive. But that work can not possibly take \$200,000. There is no question about that. To appropriate \$200,000 for such a purpose would be a gross extravagance. I come from the fourth hog-growing State in the Union, and I am proud of it.

Indiana is the fourth greatest hog-growing State in the Union, but our farmers will condemn as gross extravagance the use of \$200,000 to demonstrate the efficiency of hog serum. The amount of money we are spending to eradicate the cattle tick has nothing to do with this question. I hope to have something to say upon that later on. I understand that the Committee on Agriculture at the proper time is prepared to present an amendment appropriating \$45,000 for demonstration work in

cholera. According to the testimony in the hearings this will carry the work to four centers, or organize this work in four different States of the Union through the Department of Animal Industry to demonstrate the fact whether the hog cholera serum is a preventive or not, and when that amendment comes on the floor of the House I propose to support it. The States of the Union themselves are spending \$200,000 per year at least to demonstrate the serum remedy. In Indiana our State experiment station manufactures hog-cholera serum and supplies it at cost to our farmers. I am proud of the fact that my State is one of the pioneers in this work, and while our experiment station is furnishing serum to the farmers of my State, in the great State of Iowa, according to the official statement, they are only expending \$2,500 in this work, so I do not think it is fair for a representative of that State to insist that \$200,000 be given to this work by the National Government. The great losses from hog cholera justify every effort to prove that these losses may be prevented and the very best methods of securing these results. The appropriation of \$45,000 will secure these ends as surely as will the larger one of \$200,000, and I trust that the committee will act in a conservative manner.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement, and it will cause me to make my remarks shorter than they otherwise would be. I want to say to the committee that this matter particularly was not presented to the committee until the bill was made up, and then some gentleman came in and presented this subject. I sent for Dr. Melvin and had a conversation with him touching the matter, and after consultation with him the committee agreed to offer the amendment referred to here, giving \$45,000 for investigation along this line, furnishing the States with the information so that the States could do this work. And my colleague here was authorized to draw the amendment, and I ask him now to present the substitute—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman a question? Where does the gentleman propose to have this amendment introduced?

Mr. LAMB. Right here at the end of this paragraph.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How much does he propose?

Mr. LAMB. Forty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. To be devoted to what?

Mr. LAMB. To this serum work.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does he think that will be enough?

Mr. LAMB. That is what Dr. Melvin thinks, and Mr. Moss also agrees with me.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How many States would this demonstration reach?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Three centers, with four counties to a center.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does the gentleman think that is enough?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Enough to determine whether it is safe, or whether we have agricultural experiments in every State in the Union, and the moment we can demonstrate the methods employed are sufficient, the States may take up the work.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Let me make a suggestion to the gentleman. I have just been reading the testimony before the gentleman's committee, and I judge from Dr. Melvin's statement that as a preventive this serum which is being developed is absolutely reliable. I think the gentleman will agree with me that that is his testimony.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. That is his testimony, but I will not agree that the testimony is correct. I do not believe it is reliable.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Dr. Melvin testified that it is absolutely reliable. There is one thing in that connection—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] has expired.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] is a very reasonable one. It deals with a very important subject. If it is worth while to appropriate \$325,000 to eradicate cattle tick in the Southern States, it ought to be worth while to appropriate \$200,000 to eradicate hog cholera. The hog values of the Nation are almost equal to the cattle values.

I think the annual value of beef cattle raised in this country is about \$790,000,000, while the average annual value of the hogs raised in the country is about \$528,000,000. No dollar of public money has been expended in an attempt to eradicate hog cholera, and the time has come when the States of the Union ought to

demand of the Federal Government some recognition of this great industry.

It has been said that no serum has yet been discovered which is efficacious in the eradication of hog cholera, but the testimony of men who are qualified to speak is to the effect that a serum has been discovered which is effective. Two hundred thousand dollars is not a large sum for so important an object.

Mr. LAMB. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say that Dr. Melvin has stated that \$45,000 will do.

Mr. MADDEN. If Dr. Melvin said that \$45,000 is sufficient, why does Dr. Melvin and those connected with the Department of Agriculture think it is necessary to expend \$325,000 for an object not more important than hog raising?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Does the gentleman mean \$200,000 to eradicate hog cholera by a cure, or \$200,000 to demonstrate the proper method of applying the serum? What does the gentleman mean by the expenditure of \$200,000?

Mr. MADDEN. What I mean by the expenditure of \$200,000 from the Federal Treasury is to use that money for every legitimate purpose, with the end in view of eradicating the hog cholera, and thereby enabling the men who are engaged in the industry of raising hogs to get the best possible percentage of hogs which can be grown and sold to the people of the United States.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman again yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Does the gentleman believe that with \$200,000 the Department of Agriculture can go into all parts of the United States and make such a demonstration as the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MADDEN. I believe the Agricultural Department of the United States should go into every part of the United States where it is necessary to go in order to demonstrate to the people who are engaged in the business of raising hogs how they can successfully raise them, and how hog cholera can be successfully eradicated.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. That is not the question that I asked of the gentleman. What I asked the gentleman was if he believed he could take \$200,000 and do that work?

Mr. MADDEN. I think so; and after they have made the experiment and it is discovered that more than \$200,000 is needed, then I think it will become the duty of the United States to make any further appropriation that may be needed to accomplish the object in view.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I believe with the gentleman there, but I want to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Is it not a fact that with \$45,000 it will be demonstrated whether or not the serum is an effective preventive against hog cholera, just as certainly as it would be with an appropriation of \$200,000?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not say that that will be so, because with an expenditure of \$45,000 the department will be limited in its experiments to one or two or three experimental stations, and I believe that experiment stations should be established in every section of the country.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I know that the gentleman is thoroughly familiar with the testimony, because he was present at the hearings when the testimony was taken by the committee. Now, Dr. Melvin claimed that the appropriation should be made in multiples of \$15,000, and therefore if \$45,000 were appropriated they would have experiments going on at three different points. If \$200,000 were appropriated, experiments could be conducted at 13 different points. The only difference between the \$45,000 proposed and the \$200,000 suggested by the gentleman would be the difference between conducting experiments at 3 stations and conducting them at 13 stations.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and experiments should be conducted within the territory embraced between the 13 stations.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. It will be the difference between 3 points and 13 points?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but there is no more reason why the experiments should be conducted at 3 points than there is that they should be conducted at 13 points. The fact is that every section of the Union is entitled to exactly the same treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I think there is some misunderstanding as to the amount recommended by Dr. Melvin, and I therefore call attention to the testimony of Dr. Melvin before the committee of which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS] is chairman. Mr. SLOAN asked him this question:

For the ensuing year, what reasonable amount of funds might prudently and effectively be used along the lines you suggest?

Dr. MELVIN. Of course, in demonstration work of this character the committee would consider that estimates that we made might materially be decreased later, as when the methods were put into practical operation by States, and we would have to, in making any estimates, figure on the maximum expenses rather than on the minimum expenses, because we would not care to undertake an experiment of this sort without being able to put it through successfully. I think that in taking a block of counties of, say, four in a State, considering the maximum number of men that we would require and the maximum amount of serum that we would require, and all that, it would be an item of probably \$15,000 for that block of counties.

Now the question is, How many blocks of counties would be needed in the experiment? The gentleman's suggestion of an amendment is based upon the idea that there should be only three experimental stations. Now, I have doubt about three being enough. This is a question involving the meat supply of the United States. In the last 10 years, according to information furnished by the last census and according to figures of the Agricultural Department, our population increased 21 per cent. Milch cows increased 20 per cent; beef and other cattle, if I have the figures correctly in mind, decreased 18 per cent; sheep decreased 14 per cent; and hogs decreased 7 per cent. There is nothing more devastating among farm animals than hog cholera. Therefore there is nothing of more material interest as involving the food supply of the country than this very question of hog cholera. So it seems to me we ought to consider very carefully the amount of the appropriation. I would not advocate an excessive appropriation, but I would advocate an appropriation that would be sufficient to put this serum into as many hands as possible for effective use.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. In the first place, take Dr. Melvin's testimony that the appropriation ought to be in multiples of \$15,000.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. The gentleman is also aware that the different States are also experimenting with the serum cure.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I understand they are; but I understand that some of the serums put forth by the various States are not efficient. I get that from Dr. Melvin's testimony. Is not that the gentleman's understanding also?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I think the gentleman is mistaken. It is not the serum from the States, but some of this serum is also being manufactured by private parties and being sold, and it is that serum which is being manufactured from private sources that he says is inefficient. I do not understand that Dr. Melvin challenges any serum that is being put out from State sources.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. It may be that the gentleman is right, but I understood that it was from State sources, and I understood that it was because of inefficient manufacture or production of the serum.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I think the gentleman is aware of the fact that in Indiana we have a station supported by the State, where they manufacture the serum under the formula of the National Government, and it is supplied to any farmer in the State at cost through a veterinarian. The experiment is going on in all parts of Indiana. The same thing is done in practically every hog State. The question is: Why are not the ravages of hog cholera being checked? And on the part of those people who originally brought this question to the attention of Congress the contention is that the National Government ought to go out on a campaign of education, taking this serum and making public demonstrations sufficient to prove to the people of the United States the proper method of its use.

Mr. HOBSON rose.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee may be heard on this proposition.

Mr. MANN. Can you not fix a time to close debate?

Mr. LAMB. If the Members of the House will turn to page 10, they will find that this \$620,000 in a lump sum provides for the purchase in open market of samples of all tubercular serums and analogous products of foreign and domestic manufacture which are sold in the United States for the prevention, protection, treatment, and cure of diseases of domestic animals. In addition to that I have from Dr. Melvin in private conversation information as to the amount of money that will be necessary. I know nothing about the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department, but I am surprised to find that the views of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS] coincide so much with mine. I want to say to gentlemen that an amendment will be offered covering the

whole thing and give you sufficient money to test these matters. You are not going into the States to tell the people what to do, as you do in the cattle-tick business. The States have to buy the serum after the Department of Agriculture ascertains what will destroy the cholera and do the work. I am informed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] that the State of Illinois is now doing that.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is the State doing?

Mr. FOSTER. The State of Illinois is furnishing a serum; they have established a laboratory.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. So has Michigan, but not efficiently nor effectively.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know how much they furnish. Originally the National Government helped the State to establish a laboratory. For instance, they would have to have an old immune hog. I am informed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS] that the State of Illinois spends \$22,500 in this work.

Mr. MANN. The State of Illinois raises more fat hogs and loses more by cholera than any other State in the Nation.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the great trouble with Illinois has been in shipping hogs from some other State into our State.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The stockyards at Chicago make that record?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. You lose a great many hogs in the stockyards.

Mr. HOBSON rose.

Mr. LAMB. I will yield to the gentleman from Alabama for a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, am I recognized simply to ask the gentleman from Virginia a question, or am I recognized for five minutes?

Mr. LAMB. I will yield the floor to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is a question whether this work that is proposed to be done with the money carried by this amendment is available or not, or whether it should be available for more than simply demonstration purposes as to its present efficiency so as to cover further experimentation and develop greater efficiency, both for curative as well as for demonstration purposes.

Mr. LAMB. We propose to divert \$45,000 especially for that work.

Mr. HOBSON. I do not believe we ought to be limited. If they need more money that money ought to be provided, so that the field covered should not simply be an ocular demonstration to the people of localities of the effectiveness of existing serum, but to the manufacture of serum, now in an experimental stage, and the Government can very properly encourage investigations as to that manufacture.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. It is in the experimental stage.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama to the fact that since 1908 an almost perfect serum for the prevention of hog cholera has been in use by the Government. The testimony of Dr. Melvin is that he can not push out this serum so it will be of benefit to thousands of farmers who are losing hogs by cholera because of the insufficiency of the fund—that it would take a great deal of money. If the gentleman from Alabama would yield long enough I would like to read to gentlemen from Dr. Melvin's statement on how perfect that serum is.

Mr. HOBSON. I think I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, and that the great need of the whole Government is that its available information should be taken down to the people for actual practical use. But the fact remains that the question of serum has not passed beyond the experimental stage. If I did not go further I could quote many statements by gentlemen that in many cases the manufacture of this serum is not as perfect as could be wished. Take my own district. We have been calling on the Government to make a demonstration. Yesterday we had an appeal that cholera had sprung up in a peculiar way, and they wanted the Government to send down and test 300 hogs, and actually the United States Government did not have enough serum to inoculate 100 hogs, and they would have to go to Ames, Iowa, and see if perhaps they could not get them to work some kind of a manufacturing process to supply serum for 200 hogs for a special purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the committee understand the importance of this question. It is not alone in the interest of the farmers, but it is in the interest of the public at large, and especially the laboring man. I represent a district which is one of the largest producers of swine in this country. I have had some practical experience in rais-

ing these animals myself. Hogs are now quoted in the Chicago market at 8 to 9 cents a pound, live weight. I have no hesitation in saying, from actual experience, that if hog cholera could be stamped out hogs could be produced in Iowa so that they could and would be sold in the Chicago market for 4 to 5 cents a pound.

They could be produced there at a profit at the latter price if there was no cholera. We can not do anything more in this House to reduce the cost of living to the poor man than to give him what was formerly his cheap meat, and to do that we will have to make some substantial provision for stamping out all hog cholera. That is what we need here more than anything else to reduce the cost of living. I know, from experiments in my own district, that the Government serum has been fairly successful, but the only trouble has been, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] has stated, that the Government did not have enough of it to use in any substantial quantity.

Mr. HOBSON. And until you can get a sufficient quantity you can not standardize the manufacture. It is now made in such an infinitesimal scale that it can not be made efficient and effective.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We have found also that the serum furnished by the State is not effective and has not been of advantage to the users.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. On what does the gentleman base his statement that the serum produced by the State is not effective?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Because people who are reliable have written me to that effect, and I believe their statements.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Then the gentleman is basing it on the statement of some one whose hogs were vaccinated with it and failed to escape from the ravages of cholera?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What better authority could I have?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I just wanted to know.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have taken it from actual experiments and workings of the use of the serum, and I have taken the effect of the Government serum from the same source. If this House wants to reduce the cost of living, it can do it in no more effective way than to give a liberal appropriation for the purpose of stamping out hog cholera.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, to show that the serum that has been manufactured by the Government is a little beyond the stages of experiment, I want to read from the testimony of Dr. Melvin, who says of one experiment:

July, 1908, Kansas City experiment. Thirty-five young shoats were purchased from a farm where hog cholera had not existed. These pigs, having been carried to Kansas City stockyards and being in charge of a committee appointed by the exchange, were treated as follows: Twenty-two were injected with antihog-cholera serum prepared by the bureau; 4 were injected with virulent hog-cholera blood; 9 were not treated in any manner. All were placed in the pen together. As was expected, the 4 pigs inoculated by virulent blood contracted hog cholera within a short time and died. The 9 checks contracted hog cholera from those which were inoculated with hog-cholera blood, and they also died. The 22 pigs treated with the serum remained well, with the exception of 1 or 2 which were slightly affected on one or two days. It is not certain, however, that the trouble with the treated hogs was hog cholera, as none died.

Mr. Chairman, if that does not show that the serum manufactured by the Government is away beyond the stage of experiment, then I do not understand the English language.

Mr. HOBSON. The trouble is with the manufacture of it.

Mr. GOOD. The trouble has been with the manufacturers of patent medicines. They have never wanted the Government to manufacture serum that was worth anything. The manufacturers of worthless patent medicines have stood as a bar to giving to the people of this country an effective hog-cholera remedy.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, can not we have some agreement by unanimous consent with reference to the time that this debate shall run?

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I will try to do that presently.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the question which concerns the House the most at this time is not as to the number of hogs that die from cholera but what will we do with the serum, what is its merit? Will the serum when properly applied protect hogs from hog cholera? Will it cure, will it prevent hog cholera? Is it of practical value? And as to that I think it is safe and well for us to accept the statement of Dr. Melvin, who claims the credit of having discovered this serum. I will read from his letter of September 25, 1907, to the Secretary. He says:

The result obtained shows quite clearly that a comparatively certain method of protecting hogs from hog cholera has been discovered.

In Bulletins Nos. 72 and 102 we find that extensive experiments have been made, with splendid results; in fact, all the bulletins and Government reports printed on the subject corroborated Dr. Melvin's statement that the serum is a comparatively

certain method, not as a cure nor a certain preventative, but a comparatively certain method of preventing hogs from hog cholera. On the other hand, we find a number of people skeptical as to its practical value. I hold in my hand a clipping from an Iowa daily. The editorial therein comments on the Iowa State Legislature's dealing with the problem. It states that the State legislature is stumped and afraid to tackle the proposition. Its special Des Moines correspondent calls attention to a letter written by Park, Davis & Co., a company which I believe is, if not the largest, one of the largest manufacturers of drugs and medicines, reliable and, I believe, in high standing. The letter, purported to be written by the firm, states that the firm has for 20 years been experimenting on the subject of hog cholera and proper methods of treatment, and has investigated a great many proposed remedies for the control of this disease, but thus far it has not been sufficiently impressed with any product that it has investigated to warrant the firm's recommending it or putting it on the market. They add that they have spent considerable money in investigating this particular hog-cholera serum, and after so doing they come to the conclusion not to embark in the manufacture of this product, because it was altogether too uncertain in its action to warrant their doing so. They call attention to the National Live Stock Sanitary Association, which met in Chicago in December, including our own State veterinary, taking strong exception to the product; also to the fact that Canadian newspaper clippings, of recent date, go to show that the Canadian Government at Ottawa has become so skeptical regarding this serum that they have prohibited its being imported into Canadian territory.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. BOOHER. If the Government has discovered a formula for the prevention of hog cholera, what is there to prevent the Government authorities from making that known to the State and county authorities?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is exactly what the department did. The department claims that it has made a discovery which has merit, and others claim that it has no merit and that it is of no practical value. We have been trying to force this onto the States. The department maintains a station in our State within a mile of the gentleman's district, a few miles from his home. This station has been maintained at Government expense with a scientist in charge to demonstrate to the people of Iowa and the country that this discovery, the serum, is of value, not as a cure, but a preventative of hog cholera.

Mr. McKENZIE. How much money was expended last year for the purpose of eradicating hog cholera?

Mr. HAUGEN. In the State of Iowa?

Mr. McKENZIE. No; by the United States Agriculture Department.

Mr. HAUGEN. My understanding is that the department expended about \$10,000 last year, besides the States appropriated large sums of money for the purpose of advancing the serum treatment, as, for instance—

Ohio appropriated.....	\$40,000
Pennsylvania appropriated.....	25,000
Missouri appropriated.....	25,000
Illinois appropriated.....	22,500
Nebraska appropriated.....	15,000
Minnesota appropriated.....	6,000
Iowa appropriated.....	2,500

In all, more than 25 States have appropriated money for the purpose.

The department and the committee have been criticized for not expending more money. One gentleman says that the department does not keep enough serum on hand to supply the demand. Well, let us see about that. Congress appropriated \$600,000 for the current year and the committee has recommended \$620,000 for the coming year for the lump sum under consideration. If only \$10,000 of that amount was used for providing the people with the serum and demonstrating the best method of preventing cholera, it is not the fault of Congress, as every dollar of the \$600,000 was available for that one purpose, and I further submit that if the department used only \$10,000 out of the \$600,000 appropriation for this purpose, and if the department got all the money it asked for, then that is evidence that the \$10,000 was all that it deemed necessary to expend, and that the department adhered to the plan suggested in its report and bulletin; that is, that after the department had made the discovery of the serum and had demonstrated its value the States should carry out the work.

Now, a word about lump-sum appropriation. In this bill, as in many other bills, we necessarily make lump-sum appropriation for a number of projects and leave it to the discretion and judgment of the department as to how and for what project or

projects it is to be expended, as it is impossible for Congress to determine in advance the amount necessary for each project, for it can not foresee the emergencies that may arise. Furthermore, if appropriations are made for specific projects, the work of an employee whose salary is paid out of this one specific fund must be confined to that one project, and it is often necessary to send a number of men to the same place to carry on different and other lines of work, whereas one employee, if paid from the lump-sum appropriation, may work on a number of projects and thereby save expense to the Government. Hence it seems wise in many instances to appropriate lump sum for several items and leave it to the department to determine how and for what project or projects the money shall be expended. That is what we have in this case; and, Mr. Chairman, with a man at the head of the department who has always taken deep interest in matters of this kind, it seemed safe at the time the appropriation was made for Congress to trust to the judgment of the department to apportion the lump-sum appropriation between the projects; and considering it all, if Congress could not trust the department with apportioning that lump sum, what department could be trusted with apportioning lump sums appropriated? Now, this is quite different. A question has been raised as to the practical value of the serum, and the committee, after consideration, decided to recommend that the appropriation for the current year of \$600,000 be increased to \$620,000, with a proviso that not less than \$45,000 should be set aside for demonstrating the best methods of preventing hog cholera.

If the amendment agreed to by the committee is adopted, then the department must set aside \$45,000 for that purpose, and the \$45,000 can not be used for any other purpose. If other amendments proposed to simply increase the lump-sum appropriations are adopted, the department is left to do as it pleases, whether it will use a dollar for the purpose or not, and in all probability it will use the same amount used heretofore. The purpose sought by the committee is to compel the department to demonstrate and settle the question whether the serum has any practical value or not. The committee thought that inasmuch as its merit had been questioned it is due that the department should demonstrate as to its practical value; and if, after it has been given a thorough trial and its value is determined, and if found of value Congress can then appropriate or turn it over to the State as suggested and as was done by the department. In short, first ascertain its value, then appropriate and apply the remedy. That is what an ordinary business man would do, and it seems to me that that would be the proper thing for Congress to do, and I trust that the proposed amendments to simply increase the lump-sum appropriation, without a proviso instructing the department in the matter, which may defeat the purpose sought by the committee, will not be agreed to.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there is difference of opinion as to the practical value of the serum, for the benefit of those who may care to have the information given in the reports, bulletins, and clippings which I have referred to, and without expressing any opinion as to its merit, I send to the Clerk's desk bulletins, reports, and clippings referred to and ask that extracts of same be read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be read in the gentleman's time.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield, but I would prefer to have this article read first.

Mr. GOOD. Who is the author of this article about to be read?

Mr. HAUGEN. It will explain itself.

Mr. GOOD. I would like to know—

Mr. HAUGEN. I say it is an editorial from a daily paper and from a special correspondent of this paper, and it will explain itself.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOG-CHOLERA CURE.

The Iowa Legislature, with the facilities within her borders for fighting hog cholera, seems to be stumped and afraid to tackle the proposition.

Dr. W. B. Niles, of Ames, an animal-husbandry man working for the United States Government, is the scientist who has perfected the cure. Dr. Niles is not connected in any way with the State agricultural college. His work is entirely independent of the work of the State institution. His laboratory was established there because Ames was his home. The Ames College has made no effort toward working out a cure except to follow the directions of Dr. Niles.

The following from the Times special Des Moines correspondent says: "A note of discord in the movement to have the State of Iowa go somewhat deeper into the manufacture of serum for the treatment of hog cholera appeared when Representative Groat, of Blackhawk, showed members a letter he has received on the subject that will be of very great interest to all stockmen. He had written the firm of Parke, Davis & Co., Detroit, to see if it would be possible to secure from a reputable firm of manufacturing pharmacists a supply of serum for use in Iowa in case it is not possible to get the right legislation for a State laboratory. In the reply this well-established firm said:

"From your letter we judge that you have in mind the serum or sera recommended by the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department

of Agriculture, Washington. We may state that we have for something over 20 years been experimenting on the subject of hog cholera and the proper method of treatment. We have investigated a great many proposed remedies for the control of this disease. Thus far we have not been sufficiently impressed with any product that we have investigated to warrant us in the belief that we could place it on the market with the assurance that it would be affording a sufficient measure of success, either as a prophylactic or curative agent, to warrant our doing so.

"Referring specifically to the so-called 'hog-cholera serum,' after spending considerable money in investigating the question, we came to the conclusion about a year ago that we did not wish to embark in the manufacture of these products, chiefly because we felt they were altogether too uncertain in their action to warrant our doing so. We see no reason for changing our attitude at the present time. Particularly does this conclusion seem wise in view of the recent criticisms that have been offered against these products at the last meeting of the National Live Stock Sanitary Association, which met in Chicago in December. Your own State veterinarian, if we are not mistaken, took very strong exception to the products. We learn from a Canadian newspaper clipping of recent date that the Canadian Government at Ottawa has become so skeptical regarding the value of these serums that they have prohibited their being imported into Canadian territory.

"To sum the matter up, we do not feel warranted in making any provision at this time for the manufacture of the so-called 'hog-cholera serums,' and do not anticipate placing them on the market. We regret very much that it is necessary for us to come to this conclusion, especially as we realize the great commercial possibilities of a successful agent for controlling hog cholera, but in view of our knowledge up to the present time and our own experience we are forced to the conclusion that we can not render sufficiently valuable service to the farming community to warrant our placing the products on the market."

"This is taken by members not to mean that no good can come from the manufacture of the serums, but that great care should be taken in the matter, and, in fact, that there should be no administering of a serum except under the direction of a veterinarian. About all the success in heading off hog cholera in Iowa has come from the homemade medicine, while it is asserted that importation of stuff has been only to make matters worse."

THE CONTROL OF HOG CHOLERA BY SERUM IMMUNIZATION.

[By A. D. Melvin, D. V. S., Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry.—Annual Report of the Bureau of Animal Industry, 1908.]

FACTS ON WHICH TREATMENT IS BASED.

As a result of experimental work conducted by the Biochemic Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry and recorded in Circular 43 and in Bulletin 72 of this bureau the conclusion was reached that the so-called hog-cholera bacillus is not the true cause of hog cholera, but that this organism plays the part of a secondary invader, the true cause of the disease being a virus which is present in the blood of hogs affected with hog cholera, and which, under certain conditions of filtration, is capable of passing through the finest porcelain filters. Up to the present time this filterable virus has resisted all attempts at artificial cultivation, and we know of its presence only through the effect upon hogs when fluids from sick animals, free from all known bacteria, are injected into susceptible animals. It is a well-known fact that hogs which have recovered from an attack of hog cholera are completely immune when subsequently exposed to the same disease.

These two facts—the presence of the filterable virus in the blood of hogs sick of hog cholera and the immunity in hogs which have recovered from an attack of that disease—form the basis for the preparation of the serum which we have used successfully in immunizing hogs against cholera.

METHOD OF SECURING IMMUNE SERUM.

Without attempting to go into the method of producing this serum in detail, it will be sufficient to say that the protective serum is produced by a process of hyperimmunization carried out as follows:

An immune hog is injected with large amounts of blood from hogs sick of hog cholera. These injections will not produce more than a transitory effect upon the health of the immune, although they would prove certainly fatal to a susceptible hog. This treatment of immune hogs with large amounts of virulent blood is known as hyperimmunization, and gives to the blood of the immune the power to protect susceptible hogs from hog cholera. After a week or so, when the immune has recovered from the effects of this treatment, blood is drawn from that animal by cutting off the end of the tail. The blood drawing is repeated three or four times at intervals of a week, after which the immune is usually bled to death from the carotid artery. After each drawing from the immune the blood obtained is defibrinated and mixed with a suitable antiseptic. If preserved in sterile bottles, this defibrinated blood, or serum, as it is called, will retain its potency for years.

The protective serum having been obtained from an immune hog in the manner indicated, the potency of this serum is determined by injecting susceptible pigs with varying amounts, and at the same time exposing them to hog cholera along with untreated control animals. In practice it will, of course, be found best first to collect large quantities of serum and to mix this before testing. A standard serum will thus be secured at a minimum cost.

METHOD OF PROTECTING SUSCEPTIBLE HOGS.

A standard serum of known potency having been secured, either of two methods may be used for protecting susceptible pigs. These are known as (1) the "simultaneous" method and (2) the "serum-alone" method, or simply the serum method.

The first of these, which is to be recommended for use especially in herds which have not been exposed to hog cholera, consists in injecting subcutaneously on one side of the body of the pig to be vaccinated a suitable quantity of serum, and simultaneously on the other side of the body a small quantity of virulent blood taken from a hog sick of hog cholera. Experiments have shown that by this method pigs are given a firm immunity, lasting at least six months and probably longer.

The serum-alone method, which consists simply in the injection of the protective serum without the simultaneous use of virulent blood, appears to confer only a temporary immunity upon the treated pigs, unless they are exposed to hog cholera a short time after receiving the serum, in which case they also acquire a lasting immunity. For these reasons this method is admirably adapted to the treatment of hogs in a herd where hog cholera has already broken out but which have not themselves shown visible symptoms of disease.

The experiments which are being carried out to determine the curative properties of the serum are not yet complete, but from the results thus far obtained we know that serum in the doses used for immunization can not be depended upon to cure hogs which already show visible

symptoms of hog cholera. Further work along this line is needed. Neither the simultaneous nor the serum-alone method, when properly applied, appears to injure the hog in any way.

COST OF THE SERUM.

In order to determine the cost of producing serum for practical use every item of cost would, of course, have to be taken into account and allowance made for all sources of revenue. Owing to the conditions under which the work of the bureau has been carried on—that is, manufacturing serum for experimental use only and utilizing the same force for the production of the serum and for carrying on varied experiments—it is impossible to determine the exact cost of the serum thus far produced. Sufficient work has been done, however, for an estimate to be made. With the dose of serum at 20 cubic centimeters and with the production carried out with strict economy, it seems likely that the cost per dose can be brought within 25 cents. This estimate is based upon the supposition that each hyperimmunized immune will furnish 150 to 200 doses of serum, and that the carcass of the immune after final bleeding will be utilized for food. There seems to be no objection to the use of such a carcass for food purposes, provided the post-mortem examination discloses no reason for rejecting it.

RESULTS OF PRACTICAL TESTS OF THE SERUM.

The statements made above concerning the protective power of serum from hyperimmunized immunes are based upon tests on several thousand hogs. These tests were carried out not only in small experiment pens, but in great part upon farms under practical conditions. During the fall of 1907 approximately 2,000 hogs were treated on 50 different farms, a considerable proportion of untreated hogs being left in all cases as a control on the action of the serum. Both methods of treatment were used, and the herd conditions varied widely.

"In the herds where hog cholera appeared subsequent to treatment practically all of the treated hogs remained well, while more than 65 per cent of the checks died. In the herds which had been exposed but were apparently well at the time of treatment 4 per cent of the treated animals died, while approximately 90 per cent of the checks succumbed. In the herds where disease existed at the time of treatment, and where very great success was not expected, 13 per cent of the treated animals were lost, whereas 75 per cent of the checks died.

These successful field trials, confirming as they do numerous tests carried out under experimental conditions, have convinced us of the efficiency of this method of dealing with hog cholera, and although improvements will undoubtedly be made in many of the details of producing the serum, the method is believed to be now in such condition as to make the practical use of it entirely feasible.

CONFERENCES OF FEDERAL AND STATE REPRESENTATIVES.

In order that the States most concerned in this subject might be brought into closer relation with the work, and also for the purpose of discussing plans for effective coordination of State and Federal work in dealing with hog cholera, 25 of the chief hog-raising States were requested to send representatives to Ames, Iowa, where the Bureau of Animal Industry maintains a farm devoted to experiments with hog cholera. In response to this invitation representatives from 20 different States visited Ames and were shown the details of the serum production.

A general discussion at these conferences developed the practically unanimous opinion on the part of State and Federal representatives that the serum should be prepared by each of the States for distribution to the hog raisers, and all State representatives expressed their intention to undertake the work as soon as funds could be secured. At the present time a number of States have actually begun work. If the serum is prepared in sufficient quantities there seems to be no doubt that a great saving can be effected simply by treating animals in exposed herds or in herds in which the disease has just appeared.

A PLAN FOR CONTROLLING AND ERADICATING HOG CHOLERA BY SERUM IMMUNIZATION.

It has already been stated that the serum from hyperimmunized hogs can be used to protect hogs from hog cholera and that a large saving can be effected if the serum is applied promptly after the disease appears in a herd. Why, then, should not this serum be used as an agent for the eradication of hog cholera? It seems reasonable to believe that it can be used successfully for this purpose, but complete success can not be expected without proper organization and the direction of the work by health authorities.

In order that the possibilities of well-directed work along these lines may be brought to the attention of those who may in the future have this work to perform, the following plan for combating hog cholera through serum immunization is submitted:

1. The serum should be prepared by the State experiment stations or by State live-stock sanitary boards which are properly equipped with laboratory facilities, the efficacy of all serum to be determined by such laboratories before distribution.
2. The field application of the serum should be in the hands of the State live-stock sanitary board or State veterinarian.
3. The State should be organized into districts, each in charge of a deputy State veterinarian or a deputy appointed by the live-stock sanitary board. These districts should be small enough to permit the deputy to exercise close watch over them.
4. The deputy State veterinarian should keep a supply of serum on hand, so that prompt action may be taken when infection appears.
5. Hog raisers generally throughout the State should be informed when the serum is available for distribution, and if necessary compulsory notification of the presence of disease in a herd should be imposed.
6. Upon notification to the State live-stock sanitary board or State veterinarian that hog cholera has appeared in a certain neighborhood, the diseased herd or herds should be immediately quarantined, the premises disinfected as thoroughly as possible, and all hogs on the farm which have been exposed or which are not visibly ill should be treated with serum alone. All hogs on the farm which have not been exposed should be treated by the simultaneous method, and of course the prompt removal of dead animals should be enforced. At the same time all hogs on surrounding farms should be treated by the simultaneous method.

Prompt action of this kind should result in confining the disease to the first herd where disease appeared, though we must admit the possibility of infection being carried beyond the vaccinated belt by birds. If this should occur, the procedure should be the same as in the first

case of disease, though the probability of dissemination by birds will not be great, owing to the comparatively small size of the infected area.

With a well-organized live-stock sanitary board and an efficient corps of deputies throughout the State, there seems to be no reason why hog cholera should not be kept well under control and perhaps in time eradicated by proceeding in the way indicated. By starting the work in early spring or summer the task would probably be much simplified and the cost reduced to a minimum.

Aside from the eradication of hog cholera, it seems that an important saving to swine breeders and to the hog industry in general can be accomplished through the protective inoculation of pure-bred hogs. Some of these hogs represent years of patient effort on the part of breeders, and their loss is a loss to the swine industry in general, which depends for its success in great measure upon the development and preservation of the superior characters possessed by these pure-bred animals.

There is no doubt that the hog raisers would gladly cooperate with the State authorities and that as a rule any outbreak of disease would be promptly reported, as the farmer would have everything to gain and nothing to lose by so doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. May I have another minute?

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments relating thereto be closed in 20 minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for some little time on this. I would like that it be made 30 minutes so that I can have some time. I have made a careful study of this matter, and the bill was introduced by myself over a year ago after careful study of what the Government had been doing and what the governments of the different States had been doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman is out of order—

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I would like to change my motion to 30 minutes. That will give full time for the gentleman to discuss this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia now moves that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 30 minutes.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be in the attitude of objecting to closing this debate, but I think—

Mr. LAMB. We desire to put this bill through here and we rarely give on any one paragraph as much time as this. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I was discussing the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. But the motion is not debatable. The gentleman from Virginia moves that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 30 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, as follows: "At the end of line 12 strike out the semicolon and insert a colon, and add the following: 'Provided, That of this sum not less than \$45,000 shall be set aside for demonstrating the best method of preventing hog cholera.'"

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment. When the committee acted upon this bill we did not have available information that we now have upon this subject. After making some investigation we find that there is considerable loss due to hog cholera. About 90 per cent of the loss of hogs is due to this disease. It creates the greatest ravage among farm animals of any disease known to farm animals except the cattle tick. At this time there seems to be something like, according to the report of the Bureau of Statistics, \$18,000,000 a year loss due to hog cholera. Now, this is a direct loss to the producer and to the farmer and it is also an indirect loss to the consumer and to the whole country. The officials of the department were brought before some of the committees of the House to find out what investigation they had made.

For some years back the department made some investigations for a curative remedy, but after some progress the experts dropped that and looked for some preventive. In 1906 they secured what they thought was a preventive in the nature of a serum that would, when applied, prevent more than 90 per cent of all cases. That is the evidence of the department itself, furnished to the committee.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. If the department has discovered this remedy and knows it will prevent from 90 to 95 per cent of the loss, why does not the department make it known in the form of a bulletin so that it can be used? That is a thing I do not understand in this connection.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. The department has attempted from time to time to bring this information to the public and to the several States, and information has been brought to the several States, but there seems to be some lack of confidence of the public in the belief that this serum will act as a preventive.

Mr. BOOHER. If the public has no confidence in it, why appropriate a large sum of money to get them to have confidence in it? How are you going to do it that way?

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. The effort here is to bring this information to the public by way of demonstration. Now, this information has been sent out to organizations, and to some extent through the men of the department, but there has been very little demonstration concerning it.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the gentleman think we ought to pursue this as we have the cattle tick, and appropriate more and more every year for it? After you find the remedy, why not let the people use it?

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. That is the intention, but we want this remedy brought to the public by way of effective demonstration by the department.

Mr. MANN. What could you take this \$45,000 away from in the bill? You brought in \$620,000 for things that are already enumerated. Now you propose to take \$45,000 away from that. What can you take it away from?

Mr. LAMB. Read the tenth page—

Mr. MANN. I have read the bill. Which do you do, admit that your bill was \$45,000 too much or that you are going to take away \$45,000 from something that needs it?

Mr. LAMB. We do not admit it is too much; but we made estimates according to the Secretary's suggestion. And when we asked Dr. Melvin if he could use some of this money in the serum matter and in the investigations, he said he could. That is all I knew about it.

Mr. MANN. But our friend from Nebraska [Mr. MAGUIRE] said the amount in the bill was not intended to cover this when you made that report—\$620,000. If you diverted \$45,000 from that, was the \$620,000 too much when you brought it in, or are you going to take it from something else; and if so, what?

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. There is some \$9,000 carried on last year's bill for hog cholera.

Mr. MANN. That leaves \$36,000.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. All that we are attempting to do here is, that the department has used its judgment in distributing this lump sum—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman understands I am not criticizing the committee about it.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. All that we insist on now is that the Bureau of Animal Industry set aside not less than a certain specific amount for this work. He realizes that the testimony shows that it is necessary. He goes even further in his testimony here, and I will read a part of it—

Mr. MANN. What else can lose it? That is what I am trying to get at. What will you take it from? The gentleman does not desire to cripple some other service?

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Perhaps some of this other work may be finished.

Mr. MANN. You propose an appropriation of \$620,000, which was an increase of \$20,000 without including this \$40,000 item, and I assumed you knew what you were doing. What will you take that from without crippling the service?

Mr. LAMB. I asked Dr. Melvin if he could take care of this serum for hog cholera, provided we authorized him to do so in the bill, and he replied that he could.

Mr. MANN. That is an admission that you do not know what you can take it from without crippling the service.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, last August I introduced a bill to appropriate a hundred thousand dollars for this purpose. I did not do that until I had learned what the different States had done. I find there is error in the statement to-day made of what the different States have done in this way. The sums appropriated by the States amount to over \$200,000. A list of the appropriations I shall submit for the Record. I did not ask it until I consulted with Dr. Melvin, the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and Dr. Dorset, the man who discovered this serum, and they stated and put the reputation of their bureau and division behind the proposition, that they had found not a cure, but had found a preventive remedy. And the illustration they used was that it was as efficacious as was the treatment they were giving in cooperation with the various States and individuals in exterminating the southern cattle tick.

Now, I do not refer to the southern cattle tick by way of invidious comparison. I only want to state that the department has said, including Secretary Wilson, Dr. Melvin, and Dr. Dorset, that they have an efficacious and effective remedy

in the form of a preventive. I want to state this fact, too, that it is not a sectional request, because in the 10 States of this Union where the cattle tick is prevalent and where this \$325,000 is to be expended, 20 per cent of the value of the hogs of this country now exists. Over \$98,000,000 worth of hogs is in the 10 States, so that it is not sectional in any respect.

I asked for \$100,000 at that time, because the States had already appropriated \$200,000. The committee graciously granted \$45,000. I am not discussing the matter of values. But we have this serum, and we know this is true, that although it has been known since 1906—inasmuch as in that year it was patented, and patented in the interest of the American people—it has not been brought home to those who need it.

Now, I shall submit as a part of my remarks a record showing in part what the department has done by way of testing this remedy. There are numerous tests that have been made. Most of them have been conducted on farms, much as the cattle-tick tests have been made, and in every case, or nearly every case, the evidence seems clear that a beneficial effect followed the application of the serum. Especially was it true in the two large tests, one made at Omaha and the other made at Kansas City.

I shall not undertake, as I have not the time, to state fully in regard to it, but I shall invite attention to a reading of the results of this test. Here seems to be the large trouble about this remedy: It is being manufactured by various concerns. It is a vital remedy, a remedy that involves the use not only of hogs that have become immune through having had the disease and recovered, but it involves also the purchase of other hogs that must be rendered immune before the serum can be produced to any large extent.

Now, this remedy can be carried by the department to the various sections of this country, and the public has a great deal more confidence in that which the Government stands behind than in that which any individual manufacturer or any State will produce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I would like just one minute in which to answer more directly the question of the gentleman from Illinois. In apportioning this sum I notice that for the control and eradication of animal diseases they propose \$620,000. Now, we propose in this amendment to devote 7½ per cent of that to this purpose.

Mr. SLOAN. I did not understand, Mr. Chairman, that my time had expired. I want to make a statement about the loss by the cattle tick.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask two minutes in which to make my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. In these "piping times of peace," when the economies of the Nation relate most largely to raiment and food for the present and reasonable assurance for the future, the Department of Agriculture easily commands and is entitled to a larger share of the public's interest than does any other department.

Of the two great bureaus relating to production in this department that of Animal Industry perhaps is more interesting than that of Plant Industry. One large reason for this is that the development of animal industry along proper lines is the strong guaranty that our soils may not be exhausted and the production of profitable plant life thereby become reduced and difficult.

The Department of Agriculture in 1910 issued a number of maps graphically locating in the various States classes of domestic animals used for food—cattle (other than milch cows), sheep, swine.

It will be noted that of that portion of the United States, North and South, thickly populated, and where game has ceased to be a large food factor, swine is the most uniformly distributed of the various food-producing animals.

The estimated values of these three classes for 1912 was—

Cattle, other than milch cows	\$790,064,000
Swine	528,328,000
Sheep	181,170,000

When we recall the fact that this capital in hogs is turned about twice, while turned but once in cattle, and, further, when we remember that most landholders, large and limited, produce swine for home consumption and the market, and since swine products are served on more tables and on an average greater number of meals at each table than any other meat,

not only in America, but in the world, the relative importance of our swine will become apparent.

Further, the readiness and steadiness of market for swine products, stretching back through a number of decades, with increasing readiness and steadiness at present, further emphasizes the importance of this branch of our animal industry.

While tick, mange, scabies, fever, black leg, and foot and mouth diseases have attacked and afflicted the cud-chewing domestic animals for the last 50 years, and thus worried the consumer and veterinary alike, there has been practically but one serious disease attacking our swine, and that is the so-called hog cholera.

It is estimated that through a long stretch of years, 5 per cent of our swine die of natural causes. Of that 5 per cent, 90 per cent die of cholera. This estimate is too low. A record of all the States for the last 27 years show the average loss from diseases of hogs in the United States has been 7.4 per cent, 90 per cent of which would be about 6.6 per cent, which would represent the deaths caused by cholera. The following, Table A, submitted by the Bureau of Animal Industry, shows the result of hog cholera for a 10-year period, beginning with 1903 and ending with 1912:

A.—Hogs and hog cholera, 10-year period, 1903–1912.

Average annual number of hogs in United States	53,700,000
Average total losses by disease	per cent—5.1
Estimated average losses by hog cholera	do—4.5
Average annual loss by hog cholera	number—2,417,000
Average annual farm value per hog	\$7.36
Average total loss from hog cholera	\$17,789,120

The following, Table B, shows an estimate for the various States of numerical and financial loss from hog cholera in the several States for the year ending March 31, 1912.

B.—Estimate of losses from hog cholera for the year ending Mar. 31, 1912.

[Based on data compiled by Bureau of Statistics, Department of Agriculture.]

State.	Number hogs estimated in State Jan. 1, 1912.	Number of hogs lost by hog cholera.	Percentage lost due to hog cholera.	Total value hogs in State Jan. 1, 1912.	Value of hogs lost by hog cholera.
Maine.....	101,000	1,363	1.35	\$1,162,000	\$15,700
New Hampshire.....	53,000	954	1.80	556,000	10,000
Vermont.....	111,000	3,996	3.60	1,110,000	40,000
Massachusetts.....	117,000	3,685	3.15	1,322,000	45,000
Rhode Island.....	16,000	259	1.61	192,000	3,100
Connecticut.....	60,000	2,592	4.32	696,000	30,700
New York.....	777,000	20,279	2.61	7,925,000	206,900
New Jersey.....	165,000	5,940	3.60	1,864,000	67,100
Pennsylvania.....	1,141,000	37,995	3.33	11,410,000	380,000
Delaware.....	59,000	4,048	6.74	425,000	29,200
Maryland.....	345,000	23,284	6.74	2,760,000	186,300
Virginia.....	880,000	31,680	3.60	5,544,000	199,600
West Virginia.....	363,000	13,394	3.69	2,432,000	89,600
North Carolina.....	1,405,000	55,638	3.96	10,397,000	401,700
South Carolina.....	797,000	43,038	5.40	6,376,000	344,300
Georgia.....	2,098,000	169,938	8.06	14,057,000	1,138,600
Florida.....	954,000	85,860	9.00	4,961,000	446,500
Ohio.....	3,578,000	225,414	6.30	29,340,000	1,848,400
Indiana.....	4,031,000	453,487	11.25	31,039,000	3,491,900
Illinois.....	4,640,000	897,840	20.35	40,832,000	7,901,000
Michigan.....	1,382,000	49,752	3.60	11,747,000	422,800
Wisconsin.....	2,051,000	51,686	2.52	19,690,000	496,200
Minnesota.....	1,702,000	47,440	2.70	17,701,000	493,400
Iowa.....	9,689,000	697,708	7.20	94,952,000	6,837,600
Missouri.....	4,491,000	646,704	14.40	31,437,000	4,527,000
North Dakota.....	359,000	4,846	1.35	3,770,000	50,900
South Dakota.....	1,104,000	37,756	3.42	9,826,000	336,000
Nebraska.....	4,267,000	230,418	5.40	37,550,000	2,027,700
Kansas.....	2,808,000	333,590	11.88	22,183,000	2,635,300
Kentucky.....	1,724,000	108,612	6.30	9,310,000	586,500
Tennessee.....	1,574,000	99,162	6.30	9,601,000	604,900
Alabama.....	1,533,000	89,680	5.85	9,964,000	583,000
Mississippi.....	1,577,000	106,447	6.75	10,250,000	692,000
Louisiana.....	1,642,000	147,780	9.00	9,524,000	857,100
Texas.....	2,544,000	77,846	3.06	16,027,000	485,500
Oklahoma.....	1,410,000	184,005	13.05	7,755,000	1,012,000
Arkansas.....	1,738,000	218,988	12.60	9,385,000	1,182,500
Montana.....	143,000	2,445	1.70	1,416,000	24,200
Wyoming.....	43,000	464	1.08	370,000	3,900
Colorado.....	211,000	3,798	1.80	1,688,000	30,400
New Mexico.....	50,000	720	1.44	410,000	5,900
Arizona.....	22,000	237	1.08	231,000	2,500
Utah.....	79,000	1,137	1.44	711,000	10,200
Nevada.....	30,000	648	2.16	315,000	6,800
Idaho.....	212,000	2,671	1.25	1,696,000	21,300
Washington.....	246,000	4,870	1.98	2,337,000	40,200
Oregon.....	258,000	3,715	1.40	2,193,000	31,500
California.....	830,000	18,675	2.25	6,889,000	155,000
United States..	65,410,000	5,251,010	8.02	523,328,000	42,042,900

The following, Table C, represents the record of loss for the last 27 years; it will be noted that the loss above includes all diseases of swine, 90 per cent contributed by hog cholera.

C.—Swine, number per 1,000, died from disease, years ending Mar. 31, 1884 to 1912.

State or Territory.	1884	1885	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912
Maine.....	30	40	50	40	14	13	22	17	14	16	8	34	20	23	13	18	13	15	9	14	10	12	12	10	11	15	21	20	15
N. Hampshire.....	40	40	30	40	20	18	20	20	16	16	34	24	22	23	24	20	20	14	19	12	15	22	20	14	15	14	17	20	20
Vermont.....	40	30	30	30	18	15	22	17	18	33	15	51	18	24	17	25	18	24	20	24	15	18	17	14	15	14	24	19	39
Massachusetts.....	30	40	40	40	23	13	20	20	14	23	20	22	16	18	16	19	22	16	21	25	23	20	18	25	22	21	15	21	35
Rhode Island.....	30	30	30	30	23	15	18	16	17	16	27	18	21	23	27	31	18	24	19	24	25	22	19	12	23	23	22	22	18
Connecticut.....	40	30	30	50	20	14	18	23	23	37	47	43	10	25	16	19	17	19	24	30	28	23	20	18	23	21	22	28	48
New York.....	30	40	40	45	22	25	25	20	19	31	28	26	32	32	25	24	20	19	19	18	33	17	19	21	18	19	23	25	29
New Jersey.....	30	70	30	50	16	20	20	24	18	14	14	92	65	32	40	43	27	25	23	33	32	22	22	28	24	28	25	30	40
Pennsylvania.....	40	60	40	90	30	23	30	27	20	28	21	30	36	31	30	32	25	24	32	36	27	23	23	28	27	27	30	36	37
Delaware.....	40	60	80	65	37	100	70	50	40	31	40	53	59	47	57	27	37	58	101	43	30	30	28	33	36	33	80
Maryland.....	100	100	120	200	73	41	64	45	35	23	23	45	35	58	71	42	37	27	37	32	31	43	35	30	29	33	30	32	75
Virginia.....	100	100	120	270	74	50	75	55	53	65	30	44	65	75	78	37	45	43	46	61	55	43	40	45	46	42	39	35	40
West Virginia.....	100	90	60	100	67	48	85	45	50	28	22	23	40	70	79	49	49	31	26	36	35	36	31	33	25	30	28	25	41
North Carolina.....	100	100	130	200	80	63	100	72	70	95	61	81	110	98	91	61	65	49	80	64	96	97	55	65	60	40	40	40	44
South Carolina.....	90	130	140	190	74	75	85	50	62	72	85	109	110	91	75	82	73	61	82	66	75	85	50	55	57	54	50	47	60
Georgia.....	130	110	130	150	75	130	90	85	97	105	76	102	115	126	108	90	94	103	89	118	89	51	55	50	44	55	52	57	90
Florida.....	90	120	250	130	90	125	107	110	75	200	81	136	130	108	149	85	118	91	104	113	72	82	75	68	73	72	60	75	100
Ohio.....	70	50	50	80	57	38	54	60	40	34	33	50	82	103	72	65	46	55	41	50	50	38	50	40	35	35	37	51	70
Indiana.....	80	60	70	110	90	65	93	94	60	50	30	75	148	238	74	115	69	56	41	73	78	54	60	58	52	52	63	62	125
Illinois.....	90	70	150	180	86	60	70	85	75	53	39	145	242	145	104	104	68	77	47	74	58	46	48	48	40	45	41	60	215
Michigan.....	40	30	50	60	61	23	40	35	52	20	17	25	38	35	33	39	29	36	29	30	37	25	22	31	30	29	27	35	40
Wisconsin.....	50	40	40	50	57	46	32	42	41	40	32	49	41	33	50	49	31	103	31	25	27	22	20	24	23	23	25	23	28
Minnesota.....	50	50	30	40	26	34	30	24	40	26	20	36	53	92	180	79	81	94	35	39	30	21	30	33	30	33	30	29	31
Iowa.....	60	80	130	100	82	50	75	82	53	84	42	108	207	329	175	174	77	89	48	53	55	42	45	50	69	54	50	43	89
Missouri.....	90	90	160	180	95	67	80	120	50	54	58	116	203	167	110	90	70	48	44	67	77	74	65	54	70	70	50	48	160
North Dakota.....	50	80	47	34	75	45	32	38	12	22	20	48	20	18	22	24	14	20	24	13	11	16	11	25	15	17	15
South Dakota.....	50	80	47	34	75	45	29	35	40	71	90	144	220	62	39	100	82	63	54	23	95	61	45	60	50	42	34
Nebraska.....	40	150	170	100	85	55	85	145	40	46	56	126	136	159	128	98	74	140	65	77	57	46	88	75	70	75	47	35	69
Kansas.....	30	70	180	130	77	58	58	100	37	40	45	78	130	109	70	65	60	50	32	35	39	34	34	37	40	66	40	132	40
Kentucky.....	100	80	90	120	80	63	95	98	42	55	69	142	105	156	100	85	81	67	59	59	71	63	55	52	62	58	57	50	70
Tennessee.....	110	100	130	190	117	97	93	100	72	50	71	162	120	138	93	96	82	90	61	64	79	73	47	53	55	52	47	47	70
Alabama.....	150	140	200	170	80	110	103	82	80	120	69	116	130	140	79	73	78	94	69	71	82	57	60	55	56	70	48	41	65
Mississippi.....	120	150	180	200	90	80	115	82	86	90	58	88	120	132	86	79	54	85	57	41	81	69	60	57	75	65	50	52	75
Louisiana.....	180	160	160	180	95	90	93	94	53	106	62	94	115	275	135	114	101	75	99	116	85	113	120	80	85	75	65	68	100
Texas.....	140	150	200	130	73	55	75	78	37	59	47	60	80	116	56	39	39	59	61	40	37	55	42	40	30	35	30	30	31
Oklahoma.....	25	54	48	47	5	105	81	103	78	160	55	43	40	60	50	32	145
Arkansas.....	120	150	220	200	125	105	106	110	86	123	83	112	180	210	128	108	122	123	87	70	108	122	80	75	91	85	80	68	149
Montana.....	60	80	50	80	30	25	60	30	20	15	14	35	8	43	8	24	8	9	9	17	9	11	44	20	19	20	25	15	19
Wyoming.....	50	50	30	30	35	25	50	40	15	10	10	30	17	8	4	5	3	5	11	7	34	19	4	25	20	15	30	10	12
Colorado.....	40	50	30	50	40	20	50	22	16	12	15	30	60	27	18	9	17	16	30	10	23	15	24	25	20	31	18	20	15
New Mexico.....	70	70	60	60	80	67	50	43	37	12	10	17	26	58	5	2	9	10	10	20	8	18	15	17	15	17	38	25	16
Arizona.....	50	70	30	50	40	25	60	30	30	15	32	13	90	1	2	21	22	22	53	94	20	15	10	23	13	19	12
Utah.....	30	60	40	40	51	50	54	40	15	23	32	20	30	13	12	9	11	5	20	10	14	40	6	42	19	17	16
Nevada.....	50	60	50	80	30	20	35	25	32	35	80	0	23	15	2	6	47	19	10	16	18	21	20	40	30	20	8	22	24
Idaho.....	50	70	50	50	37	30	60	32	30	30	7	20	41	3	38	15	23	24	25	28	11	15	13	11	12	18	19	11
Washington.....	50	50	50	40	27	26	58	25	25	10	24	21	30	36	11	11	33	23	24	18	20	16	13	18	15	20	22	17	22
Oregon.....	60	60	30	50	30	23	67	23	24	37	10	12	22	35	18	15	22	30	27	27	13	15	12	10	16	20	20	18	16
California.....	50	70	50	100	40	25	59	48	31	29	18	49	80	52	33	56	28	53	61	57	45	33	32	50	25	31	38	32	25
United States.....	86	91	130	134	78	62	76	81	54	63	49	92	127	144	93	82	64	75	52	58	58	51	51	49	52	51	45.1	44.8	3.2

Estimated 90 per cent of loss due to hog cholera.

This loss would equal a very liberal income on the capital invested.

It was but to be expected that our great Secretary of Agriculture, who is now rounding his career of 16 years' continuous service in the presidential Cabinets of three Presidents, thus surpassing the record of all the Americans, should early and persistently direct the scientific experts of his department toward discovery of a cure for this disease, or a preventive remedy, which, if it would not cure, would check its spread.

The investigation of the scientists in the Department of Agriculture extended for a number of years toward finding a cure. In this the department was not and does not claim to have been successful. The testimony of Dr. Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and of Dr. Dorset, head of the Biochemic Division of that bureau, before the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture developed the following facts: Along the line of investigation and experiment, beginning 1903, a serum was sought which would serve as a preventive of hog cholera, and under the direction of Dr. Dorset, in 1905, was produced and administered by the department as an effective preventive. It is the theory of the scientists—

That the disease is caused by an invisible organism that is so small that it passes through the finest porcelain filters and is not discernible with microscopes of the highest power. The method, generally speaking, of production is to take the hog which has recovered from the cholera, or is for any other cause immune, and inoculate it with a sufficient amount of blood taken from a sick hog. The effect of that injection is to heighten the immunity of the immune so that its blood will contain protective substances in such amount that comparatively small portions of this treated immune serum will protect the treated hogs from cholera.

It is confidently asserted by not only the discoverer of this preventive remedy, but by the head of the bureau and the Secretary himself, that as a preventive the serum is absolutely effective.

It was reasonably considered that this preventive remedy being discovered, the process made known free to the American people, would prompt its early general production and application, but individuals, content with no attack being made upon their herds, looked to the States and the States looked to the General Government to advance its use until the ravages of the cholera, which moves in cycles and sections, comes home to

the herd owner, and then it is too late to go through the process of production and application, each of which requires knowledge, skill, and care. The result, therefore, has been that although this discovery was complete in 1905, the campaign against hog cholera has not become general and effective enough even to stay the general high rate of mortality among hogs, but the losses have actually increased, so that the estimated loss for 1912 was \$42,000,000.

The magnitude of this loss appears in the figures, but it must be understood that it does not fall entirely upon the swine owner. The loss ultimately falls not only upon the producer, but upon the consumer; and then, of course, the larger question of health to the consumer, while sometimes appearing only in the background, should challenge consideration.

Of the three great diseases attacking our meat-producing animals, hog cholera, southern cattle tick, and tuberculosis, probably rank in the order named.

The actual annual loss through death from cholera is estimated from eighteen to forty million dollars. The estimated loss for the cattle tick from four to eight million. I can not state definite satisfactory figures of the loss by tuberculosis. Of course the loss or damage arising out of lack of growth, deterioration of meats, hides, and so forth, would increase these figures in each class, more particularly perhaps in

A great deal of good can be accomplished by the Government making demonstrations throughout the different sections of the country of the efficacy of its process. If its preventive remedy is what the department claims for it, it would be money well spent to encourage and stimulate its use through every State in the Union. If it is not effective, then it should be known and the department should continue its efforts toward discovering other methods of treatment.

The department has made a number of semiprivate demonstrations and two notable public demonstrations of the manner of application with the serum treatment. I submit a part of the evidence given by Dr. Melvin, found on pages 16, 17, and 18 of his testimony before the Committee on Expenditures. The Kansas City and Omaha experiments, of course, were the most representative and hence most conclusive.

The statement is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Please furnish specific incidents of those six years where you have sent the agents of your department to centers of hog-cholera infection and demonstrated your work.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1913.

PARTIAL SUMMARY OF RESULTS OBTAINED FROM APPLICATION OF BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY'S ANTICHOLERA SERUM.

[All animals were kept under ordinary farm conditions.]

October 19, 1908 (Michigan): Infected herd. When visited 1 hog had died, 7 were sick, and 21 apparently well. Treated, 23 (3 of which were sick). Untreated, 5.
Results: Treated, survived, 22, or approximately 96 per cent; untreated, survived, none.

October 20, 1908 (Michigan): Herd slightly infected. Treated, 11; untreated, 4.

Results: Treated, all remained well; untreated, all died.

July 15, 1909 (Maryland): Experiment. Owner had lost nearly all of his herd. He bought 11 pigs and agreed to have some of these treated by the serum simultaneous method and others inoculated with virus alone to serve as checks. Treated, 7; virus alone, 3.
Results: All treated animals remained well; all virus-alone animals died.

August 25, 1909 (Virginia): Data incomplete on account of remoteness of the herd, but reported that all treated animals remained well, while all untreated ones died.

September 15, 1909 (Virginia): Data incomplete. All treated animals remained well; all untreated animals died.

December 6, 1909 (Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station): Herd infected. Treated, 43, many of which were sick; untreated, none.

Results: Survived, 29, or approximately 68 per cent; died, 14, or approximately 32 per cent.

December 21-22, 1909 (Virginia): Herd very badly infected. About 35 animals had died, and practically all of the survivors were showing symptoms of hog cholera to a greater or less degree. Treated, 113, many of which were sick; untreated, 179.

Results: Treated, survived, 79, or approximately 69.91 per cent; treated, died, 34, or approximately 30 per cent; untreated, survived, 111, or approximately 62 per cent; untreated, died, 68, or approximately 38 per cent.

These data are incomplete, as at last report some of the untreated animals were said to have been "looking badly."

February 18, 1910 (West Virginia Hospital for Insane): Herd infected. Treated, 47, many of which showed early symptoms of disease; untreated, 52.

Results: Treated, survived, 36, or approximately 76 per cent; treated, died, 11, or approximately 24 per cent; untreated, died, 52, or 100 per cent.

April 16, 1910 (Maryland): Disease just beginning. Treated, 34; untreated, 16.

Results: Final report stated that all treated animals remained well. No mention was made as to the untreated ones.

April 16, 1910 (second herd, Maryland): Data incomplete; no detailed final report. Only the general statement received that all treated animals remained well.

July 9, 1910 (Iowa): Owner had lost the greater portion of his herd and had procured 14 pigs from one of his neighbors for this experiment. The simultaneous method was employed. Treated by, 11; virus alone, 3.

Results: Treated, survived, 8, or approximately 73 per cent; treated, died, 3, or approximately 27 per cent. All virus-alone animals died.

July 21, 1910 (Nebraska): Infected herd. Data incomplete. The final report was to the effect that nearly all treated animals survived. No statement as to the untreated ones.

November 12, 1910 (Washington, D. C., Jail): Herd badly infected. Treated, 18; untreated, exact number not known.

Results: Treated, survived, 14, or approximately 78 per cent; treated, died, 4, or approximately 22 per cent; untreated, no exact data. Received only the statement that all untreated animals died.

December 2, 1910 (Maryland): Disease just beginning; 4 animals had died. Treated, 82; untreated, 34.

Results: Treated, survived, 73, or approximately 90 per cent; treated, died, 9, or approximately 10 per cent.

(The report on the untreated hogs is incomplete, but as near as could be determined 73 per cent died and 27 per cent survived.)

March 3, 1911 (Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station): Herd slightly infected. Treated, 42, 3 of which showed the early symptoms of hog cholera; untreated, 0.

Results: Treated, survived, 41, or approximately 98 per cent; treated, died, 1, or approximately 2 per cent. (This animal was one of those which were sick when treated.)

March 16, 1911 (Virginia): Herd badly infected. Treated, 24; untreated, 9.

Results: Treated, survived, 18, or 75 per cent; treated, died, 6, or 25 per cent; untreated, died, 9, or 100 per cent.

December 20, 1911 (North Carolina): Herd not infected. Treated, 4; untreated, 0.

Results: All animals remained well.

December 8, 1911 (Virginia): Herd infected. Treated, 8; untreated, 4.

Results: Treated, survived, 6, or 75 per cent; treated, died, 2, or 25 per cent; untreated, survived, 1, or 25 per cent; untreated, died, 3, or 75 per cent.

December —, 1911 (Maryland): Herd badly infected. Approximately 200 hogs had died. This herd is a very valuable one, being composed of pure-bred Duroc-Jerseys. Treated, 6; untreated, approximately, 40.

Results: All treated animals survived. No accurate figures given as to the untreated animals; only the general statement was received that "a large number had died."

January 2, 1913 (Bureau of Animal Industry, Division of Animal Husbandry): Healthy herd, and was treated by the serum simultaneous method. Treated, 60; untreated, none.

Results: All animals remained well.

January 22, 1912 (Maryland): Herd infected. One animal had died and 3 were sick. Treated, 5, 3 of which were sick when treated. Untreated, none.

Results: Three, or 60 per cent, of these animals died (sick when treated); 2, or 40 per cent, of these animals survived (well when treated).

January 25, 1912 (Columbia Hospital for Deaf): Herd badly infected. Treated, 4. Number of untreated animals could not be ascertained.

Results: All treated animals survived. Reliable data concerning the untreated ones could not be obtained.

January 26, 1912 (Fort Hunt, Va.): Herd infected. Treated, 14; untreated, 18.

Results: Treated, survived, 13, or approximately 93 per cent; died, 1, or approximately 7 per cent. Untreated, survived, 8, or approximately 45 per cent; died, 10, or approximately 55 per cent.

February 27 and April 20, 1912 (Government Hospital for Insane, D. C.): This herd was infected and kept under poor hygienic conditions. Treated, 120; untreated, 44.

Results: Treated, survived, 118, or approximately 98 per cent; died, 2, or approximately 2 per cent. Untreated, no exact figures could be ascertained concerning these hogs, but the asylum veterinarian placed it at approximately 90 per cent.

November —, 1912 (Iowa Agricultural College): Disease just beginning. One or two hogs not eating well. Treated, 24; untreated, 3.

Results: Treated, survived, 24; untreated, died, 3.

December 14, 1912 (Virginia): Herd infected. Treated, 4; untreated, 4.

Results: Treated, survived, 4, or 100 per cent; untreated, survived, 1, or 25 per cent; untreated, died, 3, or 75 per cent.

July, 1908 (Kansas City, Kans.): Experiment. Thirty-five young shoats were purchased from a farm where hog cholera had not existed. These pigs, having been carried to the Kansas City stockyards and being in charge of a committee appointed by the exchange, were treated as follows: Twenty-two were injected with antihog-cholera serum prepared by the bureau. Four were injected with virulent hog-cholera blood. Nine were not treated in any manner. All were placed in a pen together. As was expected, the 4 pigs inoculated with the virulent blood contracted hog cholera within a short time and all died. The 9 "checks" contracted hog cholera from those which were inoculated with the serum remained well with the exception of one or two, which were slightly affected on one or two days. It is not certain, however, that the trouble with the treated hogs was hog cholera, as none died. All of the autopsies on the check animals showed typical lesions of hog cholera.

August, 1910 (South Omaha, Nebr.): Experiment. This experiment was undertaken at the request of State officials and the Nebraska Swine Breeders' Association. The Union Stock Yards Co., of South Omaha, also offered to cooperate and to bear the expense incident to the purchase and care of hogs used in the experiment. Thirty pigs, weighing from 40 to 60 pounds, were purchased from a farm which had been free from hog cholera for several years. These hogs were carried to the stockyards and, on July 23, 1910, 4 of them were injected with blood from hogs sick of hog cholera. These injected pigs, which were placed in a pen by themselves, became sick on the 28th of July, at which time 18 of the remaining pigs were given one dose of the serum, while the other 8 pigs were not treated in any way. The 18 serum-treated pigs and the 8 untreated pigs were then placed in the same pen with the 4 pigs which had been made sick of hog cholera. The 4 pigs which were inoculated with hog cholera all died. The 8 untreated check pigs all contracted hog cholera from the 4 inoculated ones. The 18 pigs which were given serum and which were confined in the same pen with the 4 original sick pigs and with the 8 untreated pigs, which became sick, remained perfectly well and were finally turned over to the officials of the stockyards company upon the completion of the experiment on September 17, 1910.

In conclusion, the total number of hogs treated by both the serum-alone and the serum-simultaneous methods in the above demonstrations was 744, of which 613, or approximately 82 per cent, survived, while of the untreated hogs, which numbered 362, 228, or approximately 63 per cent, died. The figures given showing the percentage of the untreated animals which died are not absolutely correct in that in the case of two herds the report was to the effect that a large number of untreated hogs died, while in four herds it was reported that all untreated animals died. As we had no definite data as to the number of untreated animals in these herds, they were not considered in figuring the percentage.

Mr. SLOAN. The various States have appropriated for the purpose of advancing the serum treatment as follows:

Ohio	\$10,000
Pennsylvania	25,000
Missouri	25,000
Illinois	22,500
Nebraska	15,000
Kentucky	\$10,000 to 15,000
California	8,000
Minnesota	6,000
Georgia	5,000
Maryland	5,000
Mississippi	5,000
Oklahoma	3,750
North Dakota	3,000
Kansas	3,000
Virginia	3,000
Iowa	2,500
Arkansas	2,000
Michigan	1,500
North Carolina	1,500
South Carolina	1,500
Wisconsin	600

The following States have either very small or indefinite funds provided: Delaware, Indiana, New York, South Dakota, and Louisiana.

I believe that any reasonable sum appropriated and prudently spent by the Government in forwarding this work will be returned to the people of the country, who are paying very high prices for their meats many hundredfold.

If even a fair measure of success should follow the extended use of this serum or other treatment that the department may find efficacious, there would be practical encouragement given to the States and individuals for the passage and enforcement of reasonable quarantine measures looking toward the more effective check of this disease between localities where the hog raiser is careful and enterprising and those communities where the owners are indifferent and shortsighted. It is known that the cholera is easily spread from one animal to another and readily carried from one community to another. The lack of known remedy or preventive, and the disastrous results following the infection of a herd, have heretofore prompted the swine owner at the first outbreak of the disease to hasten to market those apparently not infected or least infected. In that way, in the passing from farm to shipping point and being shipped in the various stock cars through the State and into other States, establishes highways for the carriage of this disease to every slaughtering point or yards where stock hogs may be purchased and distributed.

Dr. Melvin says:

In many outbreaks of cholera the disease is subacute, and in this form an owner could ship his apparently well hogs from some Western State to a live-stock center, such as Chicago, and without the disease having been developed sufficiently at the time of their arrival at Chicago to cause suspicion. These hogs might then be bought, and frequently are bought, for shipment to eastern markets, such as Buffalo, New York, or points in Massachusetts. Under the provisions of the 28-hour law these hogs would either have to be fed, watered, and rested in the cars or unloaded in stockyards en route for feed, water, and rest. In the latter case, we would be very apt to have several centers of infection established at these unloading yards between Chicago and this eastern point. Following this, it would be quite a common matter for some farmer or stock raiser in one of these intermediate States to bring in some stock hogs, unload them in these infected pens, and distribute them among his neighbors, and thus have a number of centers of infection established. This same thing would apply to hogs which might be shipped out of a State through one of these infected railroad yards. On account of the prevalence of cholera the department does not now permit the shipping out from any of the large stockyard centers of hogs for breeding or feeding purposes, because these yards are considered as being constantly infected with cholera.

Perhaps half of our swine for slaughter are carried into interstate commerce. Cooperation in quarantining with the best results should be between the States and the Government. With the large losses confronting the producers in every State, quarantine regulations for swine shipped for slaughter have been absolutely nil or, at least, not strict. There is a decided lack of uniformity. To show this lack of uniformity, speaking roundly, the States may be placed in the following classification:

First. Those that have some general quarantining provisions.

Second. Those whose quarantine provisions of law apply only to shipments of hogs for exhibition or breeding purposes, or both.

Third. States having no quarantine regulations for hogs.

There are in the first class: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming.

In the second class: Indiana, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Washington.

In the third class: Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The production of meat for America and the world has been an important problem. To produce it at a reasonable price for the United States alone seems the future problem. The Department of Agriculture, disposing of this problem which we have discussed, has one of the most important problems of meat-food supply. Fortunately this does not relate to any particular locality or section of the United States. While some States are materially in advance of the others, yet there is no assurance that they will remain so long. A recent visit to the South, and an attendance at the National Corn Show at Columbia, S. C., where hundreds of boys were who had been raising from 100 to 200 or more bushels of corn per acre in the various States—Jerry Moore, South Carolina, 228½ bushels, at cost of 16½ cents per bushel; James A. Leach, 196½ bushels, at cost of 10 cents per bushel. This brought home the reflection that, with the increased yield of corn and other cereals in that great and fertile section, the enterprising citizens would be meeting the next important problem after production; that is, transporta-

tion. Wise and bold is the legislator who will seek to compel the great common carriers to adjust to an equitable basis transportation charges, but wiser still and more valuable to his community is he who will attempt to solve that transportation question by concentration of that product, so that the transportation company, instead of having the opportunity of hauling corn worth a cent a pound, he must ship swine worth from 5 to 10 cents a pound, reducing in that way the relative percentage of expense to value for transportation charges.

Some years ago a man whom I regard as one of the best financiers of my own State, discussing freight-rate problems, said:

Railway commissions and legislative maximum freight rates are all right, but that is not the way to beat the transportation company.

Our people are simply raising corn; it takes nearly 2 bushels of corn at this time to get the third bushel of corn to market. Feed it to your hogs, concentrate your product, your transportation burden will be relatively decreased; or feed your corn to your cattle and bring about a similar result; or, instead of shipping the beef, you may concentrate your product further, so that instead of shipping corn that will not pay its own way, ship butter, 1 pound of which will ship 15 of its kind.

This was many years ago; the large concentration of products in saving transportation costs has been doubled and in many cases trebled under the present rates and prices.

I see in the increased impetus of corn raising an increased impetus in swine producing and swine care. I believe that the Government will be doing no more than its economic duty if from time to time it shall, through liberal appropriations and zealous propaganda, teach the swine producers the use of the remedy in which the department has such faith, to the end that the loss to the producer of this property so generally owned may be reduced to a minimum, the high price of this important food be measurably reduced to the consumer, and the health of the public less seriously menaced.

The United States has more than one-third of the hogs of the world. It has less than one-sixth of the cattle and less than one-tenth of the sheep, so that the relative importance of the swine industry may be readily seen. The total value of cattle, including milch cows and beef-producing animals, in the 10 States—10 leading tick States, named in the order of their cattle interests: Texas, Oklahoma, Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, North Carolina, Florida, and South Carolina—where the southern cattle tick operates is \$287,914,000. The value of the hogs in those States amounts to \$98,696,000, which is more than one-third of the cattle value. The value of the beef animals in those States is \$162,361,000, so that as meat producers the hogs of those 10 States equal 60 per cent of their beef production. The value of the swine in the 10 leading swine-producing States—Iowa, Illinois, Nebraska, Missouri, Indiana, Ohio, Kansas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan—not including any of the southern tick States, is \$336,471,000.

As an economic factor the hog is entitled to the best of treatment. While not at any time appealing to the aesthetic or ever having been canonized, as a type of dignity he has usually "delivered the goods." He has that which many desire, and even Congressmen, having or desiring rivers and harbors, hover round his repository, "the barrel." This measure is calculated to fill the pork barrel instead of emptying it. He knows no State lines, and has not that regard to altitude, latitude, and longitude for which other meat animals are sticklers. Like a wealthy relative, he becomes most valuable when he dies a sudden and unnatural death. He has aided the pioneer to develop every State, has paid more store debts, bought more land, built more homes, lifted more mortgages, paid more freight, swelled more bank accounts, aided in the erection of more schools and churches, sent more young people to college, has been carried to more markets of the world, satisfied the hunger of more poor, tickled the palates of more rich, and regaled the tastes of more princes than any other meat-producing animal.

It can not be said of him that "he wants but little here below." He wants much; but he wants that not for long.

Remove the menace of cholera and he will become a mint for the free coinage of gold. He is more valuable than all the precious minerals of the mountains, because his veins are reliable and his stock being sold is no imposition upon the buyer.

Demonstrations by the Bureau of Animal Industry in cooperation with States and individuals to test thoroughly the Government's preventive remedy will be money and energy well spent, because if the Government has not an effective remedy, then one should be discovered and used.

The two most damaging diseases to meat animals in this country are hog cholera and the cattle tick. The loss from hog cholera is estimated at from fifteen million to forty-two million

dollars annually for a period of years. I shall submit the figures for a long period of time. Then the loss from the cattle tick by death is estimated at from four to eight millions. That statement of \$25,000,000 was inclusive of speculative losses. The estimates of Dr. Melvin for death losses are from four to eight millions. The other estimate, I repeat, is based on speculative losses, which reduce it to the basis of from four to eight millions. That is the rank of the two great diseases which reduce our general meat supply.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. How does the gentleman differentiate between speculative and actual losses?

Mr. SLOAN. When the animal dies the loss is complete; but there is an additional loss through the lack of growth and deterioration. That is speculative.

Mr. HOBSON. I can tell the gentleman that it is more than speculative. In one county where we eradicated the cattle tick we more than doubled the average value of all the cattle in that county.

Mr. SLOAN. It is still speculative, but the speculation approximates a certainty.

Mr. HOBSON. You ought to give an estimate, and I do not think the gentleman ought to count only the death loss, because the death loss is the smallest part of it. All the cattle in my district except that one county are infected with the cattle tick, and all the cattle in that county were infected until they eradicated it.

Mr. SLOAN. I want to say that on that same basis the Government, cooperating in these 10 States, has cleared a territory as great as the States of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, and what was done in that work can be done throughout the United States with the hog cholera.

Mr. HOBSON. I do not question that.

Mr. SLOAN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the committee ought to understand this situation thoroughly before it agrees to increase this appropriation by \$200,000. The situation is this: The item in the bill carries an appropriation now of \$620,000. The current law carries an appropriation of \$600,000. The committee increased that amount \$20,000, and I want the committee to know that every dollar of the \$620,000 carried in this bill is available for the use of demonstrating the best methods of preventing hog cholera. There can not be any doubt about that proposition, and the fact that this money has not been used in that direction heretofore is not a criticism of the Committee on Agriculture. It is not an evidence of the fact that we have overlooked the great hog industry of the country. It is hardly a criticism of the officials of the Agricultural Department. The fact is that the department, since 1903, has been sending out its bulletins on the prevention of hog cholera, and sending the serums out so that now 30 of the States are working on this very problem, through the serum idea.

Mr. GOOD. It is equally true that all of this \$620,000 could be expended for one of a dozen different things, and not a penny of it spent for the eradication of hog cholera.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true, and that is exactly the point I was trying to bring out. It is a question that we must leave to the good judgment of the officials who execute the laws.

Now, some suggestion has been made in reference to the cattle-tick appropriation of \$325,000. I want to call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that this work has been in operation in the South for about eight years, but the first appropriation for the purpose of demonstrating the method of eradicating the cattle tick was only \$50,000, and not \$325,000. We are not certain that the \$45,000 that the committee are willing to give will bring the result that we hope to have it bring, but we are willing to spend \$45,000 in trying out the method, in trying to ascertain if the serums are, in fact, preventives. But I do not think this Congress ought to be asked to spend \$200,000 to try out a proposition which may or may not be good. It seems to me the committee has acted wisely in the fact that it desired to start this work on a conservative basis. If it proves efficacious, if next year we have found a way of demonstrating that serum is a preventive of hog cholera, then I am sure this committee will give you every penny that the Department of Agriculture estimates for this great work. That is the sensible view for us to take. Try out the method; if it is efficient, give sufficient means to carry it to the people.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HELM. How large a force has the department available to put into the field to guarantee the execution of this work?

Mr. LEVER. In answer to the suggestion of the gentleman, I will say that I do not know how many men they have. I do not know that the department knows. Hence the committee took the sensible course and appropriated a small sum, in order that we might go at this work in a conservative rather than an extravagant manner. We are giving them nearly four times the amount that they have heretofore been using for this purpose.

Mr. HELM. So that if the committee were to vote the \$200,000, you do not know whether the department could utilize that sum or not?

Mr. LEVER. Absolutely not; and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] does not know it. Nobody knows how they would use it, or if they used it whether it would be beneficial to the country in doing what is sought to be done by this amendment. Let us be wise and start at this in a small way, and if it proves good this Congress will do the wise thing and make all appropriations necessary to give the Department of Agriculture sufficient means to carry on the work sought to be done.

Mr. TOWNER. I hope it will not be understood—it certainly is not so intended—that those who favor this additional appropriation intend thereby to cast any reflection or criticism upon the committee. On the contrary, I think the committee is remarkably responsive to the reasonable demands that are made. I am quite sure if this proposition had been originally urged before the committee an adequate appropriation would have been reported. When all the circumstances are known, this proposition ought to appeal to everyone. In the first place, it must not be understood that this serum is a cure for hog cholera. That is a mistake that not only Members of this House make, but many of the farmers of the United States have been making. It is not a cure, but it is an efficacious preventive of hog cholera. We can easily understand how much more difficult it is to get a man who has a herd of hogs that is not affected to use a preventive than it would be to get him to use a cure if his herd was affected. The work, therefore, must largely and must necessarily be a method of demonstration, a method of education, a method of taking into these communities where they raise hogs not only the serum itself, but the method of using it, and the necessity for using it, and a demonstration that its use is efficacious.

When it is understood that every State in the Union is a hog-raising State, when it is understood that interest in the prevention of this deadly plague must be universal throughout the United States, when it is understood that this work must be nation wide if it shall be carried on efficaciously, it seems to me that it must be apparent that this demonstration of the effective prevention of hog cholera must take an amount of work that will not be covered by an appropriation of \$45,000. In my judgment \$200,000 is a very small amount, and I venture to say that the next bill that will be brought in will contain an appropriation for this purpose very much larger than \$200,000.

Mr. NYE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. NYE. Does the gentleman say that this is exclusively a preventive?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. NYE. And should every man that raises hogs get this serum to prevent hog cholera?

Mr. TOWNER. I do not know exactly what is in the gentleman's mind.

Mr. NYE. I mean, if it is a preventive, must all farmers use it as a preventive?

Mr. TOWNER. That is not it. The idea is that when cholera breaks out those in the vicinity whose hogs are not affected ought to know how they can prevent their herds from being affected. The Government ought to be ready to send a man whenever there is an epidemic, so that they can take the serum there and demonstrate its use and educate these farmers who have herds in the immediate neighborhood how they can prevent loss from the epidemic.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. HELM. I am anxious to know how many hog doctors the Agricultural Department has available to use this \$200,000?

Mr. TOWNER. It is not that. The Government of the United States can secure, if they have the funds, men in every State from the agricultural colleges who will do this without sending out men directly from the department. But the United States can not do it unless they have the money to pay for it, and unless they have the serum manufactured and made available.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman believe that the Government should go any further than to simply demonstrate work in this particular?

Mr. TOWNER. I do; because the Government ought especially to furnish the serum, for the reason that patent medicine men—the frauds all over the country, who are seeking to prey on the credulous farmer—finding that the use of a serum is considered effective, will assert that their private serum is better than any other, and thus sell the farmers worthless nostrums. They ought not to be put in a position where they can deceive the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent that he have two minutes more.

Mr. LAMB. I call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The demand for the regular order is equivalent to an objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this matter it is not my purpose to in any way reflect on the committee. On the contrary, I have only the greatest praise for the committee because I think they are doing a noble work, a work that means much to the country. This is an important matter. I heartily favor the \$200,000 appropriation, and I hope the amendment will prevail. I hope, too, in the passage of the amendment, language will be employed that will restrict the expenditure of this money for this very important purpose.

In 1912 hog cholera cost the farmers of the Government \$42,042,900. That presents a serious situation. It is not only a loss to the farmers but it is a loss to the whole country, and if we can secure a remedy against it it will save to the people of the country this enormous sum of money, which is quite worth while.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a sympathetic question?

Mr. EDWARDS. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. HOBSON. Under the present condition of manufacture it costs 90 cents to get serum enough to inoculate a hundred-pound hog. That is ridiculously high, but if you standardize and systematize it it ought not to be half that amount.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson]. I think the work of standardizing and systematizing it should be undertaken.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EDWARDS. Not just now. I have only five minutes. I believe this important work can best be done through the Department of Agriculture here. In Georgia, the State is undertaking to manufacture and furnish cholera serum to the farmers. I do not know just what the amount is that is being expended there, but it is not a very large amount. I am in favor of getting results, and I believe those results can best be gotten through the National Department of Agriculture, which can work in conjunction and cooperate with the various departments of agriculture in the several States.

As I was about to remark when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] interrupted me, in 1912 Georgia raised 2,098,000 hogs. Of that number 169,938 died from cholera. That amounted to a little more than 8 per cent of the total number of hogs raised in that State for 1912. The total value of the hogs raised in Georgia in 1912 amounted to \$14,057,000. The total amount of loss through cholera in the State of Georgia in 1912 was \$1,138,000. I appreciate what the State of Georgia has undertaken to do for the farmers in protecting the hogs against cholera, but I do not think it has gone far enough, and I do not think any of the States of the Union have gone far enough in this matter; and, with all due respect to this important committee, I do not believe this bill goes far enough in the matter. I hope the amendment making the appropriation will prevail.

As has been remarked by the gentleman from Iowa, the serum is not a cure. No more is it a cure for cholera than is vaccination a cure for smallpox, but it is a preventive. If it is used in time, it will prevent the cholera getting among the hogs, just as vaccination will prevent smallpox among people. It is my impression that the cost is about 90 cents for inoculating a hog.

Mr. HOBSON. That is a 100-pound hog?

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not understand that it makes any difference as to the weight.

Mr. HOBSON. Yes; it does vary with the weight.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then, it costs many times what it ought to cost, and I would welcome legislation and action that would not only make certain this remedy but give it to the people at a greatly reduced cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time for debate has expired. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska

and the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa: Amend, at the end of line 12. Strike out the semicolon and insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That of this sum not less than \$45,000 shall be set aside for demonstrating the best method of preventing hog cholera."

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment at this juncture.

Mr. MANN. Why, it has been discussed here for half an hour.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. It comes too late.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment, or a substitute for the amendment as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer a substitute for the entire amendment?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. LAMB. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is to vote on the amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will send it up.

Mr. HOBSON. The substitute is to strike out of the amendment the words "eight hundred and twenty thousand" and insert "seven hundred and ten thousand," thus cutting down the increase from \$200,000 to \$90,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that if the gentleman will offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa it would be in order, because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska is not an amendment except by way of a substitute.

Mr. HOBSON. Then I will make it an amendment to the amendment. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already an amendment pending.

Mr. HOBSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer it as a substitute to the entire amendment as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have some doubt whether my amendment is in order properly to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment in the hope that the other amendment will be voted down and then I will offer this amendment following that.

Mr. HOBSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer also an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska can not withdraw his amendment except by unanimous consent. Does the Chair understand the gentleman asks unanimous consent?

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the figures "\$820,000" and substitute therefor the figures "\$710,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out "\$820,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$710,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to ask the Chair whether this amendment carries any direction to the Secretary of Agriculture as to how this money shall be used?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not state—

Mr. HOBSON. I make the point of order it does not matter how it is used. The gentleman has not reserved any point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MANN), there were—ayes 19, noes 43.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GOOD), there were—ayes 31, noes 35.

Mr. GOOD. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers (Mr. GOOD and Mr. LAMB) reported that there were—ayes 45, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 11, at the end of line 12, by striking out the semicolon and inserting a colon and add the following: "Provided, That of this sum not less than \$45,000 shall be set aside for demonstrating the best method of preventing hog cholera."

Mr. GOOD. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the figures "\$45,000" and inserting "\$100,000" in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the figures "\$45,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GOOD), there were—ayes 35, noes 47.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 12, page 11, after the figures "\$720,000," amend by adding: "Not more than \$30,000 of which sum may be applied to indemnifying the owners of milch cows condemned under section 2 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1895, and the regulations of the District of Columbia in relation thereto."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

Mr. LAMB. I ask unanimous consent that this may go over without prejudice until to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. That there is no authority of law for paying for these cattle that are condemned. It has been ruled here year after year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair remembers last year the exact point was up, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I have not been heard, I submit, on the point of order.

Mr. LAMB. I ask unanimous consent that it go over until to-morrow, without prejudice.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LEWIS. I understand the matter goes over until to-morrow—

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. LEWIS. I can not hear the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. It was the understanding of the Chair when the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] made that request that objections were heard.

Mr. LEWIS. I wanted to discuss it. Now, I think I have a point that the Chair might wish to consider in that connection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank the Chairman for his courtesy.

I call the attention of the committee to the fact that this amendment makes no new appropriation. The section of the bill as already framed, as it has already passed through many Congresses, makes an appropriation for specific purposes, because it clothes the Secretary of Agriculture with the power to make applications of this appropriation in the line of the amendment, and he has made applications of the appropriation in that way.

The amendment does not, therefore, consist of an appropriation or new legislation, but consists of a limitation upon an appropriation, for under the statute as it is now, under the paragraph as at present framed, the whole \$620,000 might be applied to this object, and the amendment restricts the appropriation to not more than \$30,000, and I submit is therefore not subject to the point of order which has been made. The case is so wholly peculiar that the Chair ought to thoroughly understand these facts before making a renewed ruling.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. In regard to the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I was going to ask if it was not the custom of States to pay for cattle so afflicted?

Mr. LEWIS. The whole sum is appropriated for that purpose now, if the Secretary of Agriculture chose to so regard it, and the amendment amounts to a limitation upon an appropriation and not to an appropriation itself.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question bearing on that point? In what line of the paragraph does he find authority to use that appropriation for indemnifying owners of condemned tubercular cattle?

Mr. LEWIS. I will ask the chairman of the committee to reply to that question. There is no question of the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to apply the money in that way, and it is now applied in that way in the city of Washington.

Mr. LAMB. In view of this, as well as other matters relating to it, I ask unanimous consent that this paragraph go over until to-morrow without prejudice, when one of my colleagues from Virginia will be here who can not be here to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that this paragraph go over without prejudice.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order. Does the Chair desire to hear anything further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman directs the Secretary of Agriculture to use the amount named in the amendment, \$620,000, for a certain purpose, and even if it be true that the Secretary of Agriculture might in his discretion use the entire sum carried in the bill for the same purpose, it would still be a change of law to require him to use a specified portion of that sum for that purpose.

Mr. LEWIS. The amendment does not do so. He is expending now money for that purpose. This amendment restricts the amount to which he might otherwise be unrestricted, and which he might expend, to \$30,000.

Mr. MANN. That is not how I heard the amendment read.

Mr. LEWIS. That is the purpose.

Mr. MANN. I ask to have the amendment reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 12, page 11, after the words "six hundred and twenty thousand dollars," amend by adding:

"Not more than \$30,000 of which sum may be applied to indemnifying the owners of milch cows condemned under section 2 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1895, and the regulations of the District of Columbia in relation thereto."

Mr. MANN. That, of course, does not come in the proper place, but that is a matter easily corrected. The same question was up a year ago. While this, as the gentleman stated, does not authorize the Secretary to use it, it authorizes the Secretary to use it for a certain purpose affecting any discretion he has now, although I do not think the Secretary has any authority under the provisions of this act to pay for these milch cows.

Mr. LEWIS. It is conceded by the committee that he has, and he has acted upon it in the past.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is quite fair to say that it is conceded by the committee. It may be conceded by some. For one I take the position of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that there is no authority of law by which condemned cattle may be paid for except as they might be entering into interstate commerce. I will read, if the gentleman will permit:

The Secretary of Agriculture has the power to expend any part of this sum in the purchase and destruction of diseased or exposed animals and the quarantine of the same whenever in his judgment it is essential to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia—

And so forth.

Now, the proposition of the gentleman from Maryland is to condemn these dairy cattle in the State of Virginia and in the State of Maryland and pay for them there regardless of the fact that they are about to enter into interstate commerce and thereby spread this disease from one State to another.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois whether it is not a fact that part of this appropriation has been expended in the District of Columbia in payment for condemned animals?

Mr. MANN. Yes; but that is only in consequence of the department's construction.

Mr. LEVER. I believe that is simply a matter of construction.

Mr. MANN. If the Chair thinks there is no authority in the law, the Chair does not bother with the question as to whether somebody has expended the money improperly in one of the departments. The matter has been up on several occasions and has been thrashed out thoroughly both before and since the

gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] came into the House, and the ruling always has been that there was no authority in the law for the Secretary of Agriculture to pay for cattle condemned in Virginia or Maryland or other States having no relation to interstate commerce.

But the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] would authorize it, and it is for that purpose that it is intended. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, when one of the inspectors goes into an adjoining State and finds something the matter with the cattle, to pay for those cattle, and if that is to be the policy of the Government, the same rule should be applied to payment for hogs that have been condemned on account of hog cholera under the provisions of this act. It has already been stated that that amounts to many, many millions of dollars a year.

Mr. LEWIS. Does the gentleman from Illinois think it quite fair to argue the supposed merits of this matter when the point of order is up and the argument should be confined to the point of order and not be upon the merits?

Mr. MANN. I am not arguing the supposed merits. I am arguing the point of order, pure and simple, as to what the effect of the ruling would be holding a provision of this sort in order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, is the Chair ready to rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, but the Chair will hear the gentleman from South Carolina if he desires to be heard.

Mr. LEVER. I was about to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the statement of fact made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] as to the Department of Agriculture having paid for cattle condemned in the District of Columbia is no doubt correct. There is no question about that. But I doubt the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to do that, although I have some recollection that he got his authority from an act relating to the District of Columbia, but there certainly can be found nowhere in any of the acts touching the establishment of the Bureau of Animal Industry or in legislation since its establishment which gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to indemnify the owners of cattle that are killed, unless to prevent them from spreading from one State to another through the channels of interstate commerce, and the authority for that I read to the Chair a moment ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] if he knows any authority of law for the payment of that except that portion of the statute which the gentleman from South Carolina has read?

Mr. LEWIS. And the departmental construction that has been given to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The recollection of the Chair is that this exact matter has been before the committee some two or three times, and—

Mr. LEWIS. Does the Chair notice the expression here "to purchase diseased and exposed animals," and so on, in this last paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. No point of order is made against that, although it might be subject to it, but a point of order is made against this.

Mr. MANN. I know that the gentleman from Maryland does not intend to mislead the Chair, but that expressly provides in relation to animals going from one State to another.

The CHAIRMAN. The recollection of the Chair is that the other item referred to is substantially in the language of the law quoted by the gentleman from South Carolina. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment is not in order, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order to it. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, \$325,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike out the paragraph included in lines 13 and 14.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to certain provisions in this bill because I am opposed to paternalism of any kind, and there is more paternalism in this bill than in any other that can possibly come before Congress. It is hardly possible to so frame the Agriculture appropriation bill that all paternalism can be avoided. The best we can do is to reduce it to a minimum.

The paragraph we are now considering appropriates \$325,000 for the purpose of eradicating cattle ticks. This matter refers to one section of the country, but is of national importance,

and is defensible only on this account. In 1907 Congress began appropriating for the eradication of the cattle tick. They appropriated first \$82,500. Next year they appropriated \$150,000. For each year since then they have appropriated \$250,000, and this year \$325,000 is carried in this bill. Already there has been appropriated the sum of \$1,232,500.

Mr. HOBSON. I want to ask the gentleman whether he makes a distinction between tick eradication, which, by the way, I want to tell him, is going on very successfully in my district—whether he makes any distinction between that and the various other processes that are usually termed "quarantine," as, for instance, the extinction of yellow fever or the checking of cholera or any other scourge that is brought from abroad or from State to State; not in any locality, but as an interstate matter? I wish to know whether he regards this particular work as distinguished from the other work of saving the public at large from a scourge?

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman's question is a very elaborate one, and I really have not the time in my five minutes to answer it; but I do not discover any similarity between a quarantine law preventing the spread of cholera from one State to another, or the smallpox from one country to another, and the eradication of the cattle tick. When they have smallpox in my community, and people are quarantined, the man who has smallpox pays the doctor if he is able, and if not the county pays the bill.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman realizes that all of this is based on quarantine?

Mr. BOOHER. I know. The eradication of the cattle tick has come down to be so simple that the man who has no brains at all can get rid of the ticks on his cattle. I can prove that from the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture. I am going to read from these hearings just what each State veterinarian who was before that committee said about it.

I want the committee to remember that it is the simplest thing in the world to eradicate the cattle tick. All a man has to do is to drive his cattle through a vat that contains the dip, and the ticks are gone. Yet by this bill you are appropriating \$325,000 to help people help themselves. I have no objection to the Government spending money to find remedies for these things. I believe the Government ought to find the remedy, and after it finds the remedy I believe it ought to furnish it to the people, but I do not believe the Government ought to go over this country telling men how they must do everything, as this bill provides. Why not let the people depend somewhat upon their own intelligence?

Let us see about this. Let us take first the testimony of Dr. Dalrymple, State veterinarian of Louisiana. This is what Dr. Dalrymple said before the committee:

This tick eradication work is the simplest thing possible.

That is what the State veterinarian of Louisiana says. Then he goes on to say:

This dipping-vat process, with the standard arsenical solution, is absolutely the thing to do it with.

Now, you have a formula provided by the Government. It costs on an average \$35 to build a vat and put your liquid in. You can fill it full and dip two or three hundred cattle. Yet you want \$325,000 to enable you to do it.

How much has Louisiana appropriated to carry on this work? Five thousand dollars a year. Yet they say their loss in Louisiana is from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000 a year. That State, in the face of that fact, appropriates only \$5,000 each year to carry on that work.

Dr. Dalrymple goes on to say:

Our loss is from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000 on account of this cattle-tick business.

If it is true that you have so simple a remedy as Dr. Dalrymple says it is, I want to know why the people can not use it instead of asking Congress to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAMB. I hate to object, but we must get on with this bill.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, we have not heard such a speech as this in a long time.

Mr. MANN. Can not the gentleman secure an agreement to close debate on this paragraph and amendments?

Mr. LAMB. I am willing to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] five minutes.

Mr. BOOHER. No. I want to say to the committee that I tried to get time before the general debate closed to discuss this proposition, and I could not get it.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he allow 10 minutes on a side.

Mr. LAMB. Then, I will make it 20 minutes, 10 minutes on a side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph be closed in 20 minutes, of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] shall have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 20 minutes, of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] shall have 10 minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will not object if I can have two minutes, for I want to offer an amendment and wish to say a word or two upon it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can have five minutes if he gets recognition from the Chair, as I do not want any time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, I want to read further:

The CHAIRMAN. May I inquire what amount of money your State appropriated?

Dr. DALRYMPLE. We have been appropriating \$5,000 a year for the last seven years, but then our counties or our parishes, as we call them, have been giving money, and they are providing means in the way of building the dipping vats to be used in this work. I can not give the exact figures—I have not got them—but that is the amount of State money.

Mr. HAWLEY. Is the dipping compulsory?

Dr. DALRYMPLE. It is; yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Over what portion of the State?

Dr. DALRYMPLE. In our State it is compulsory in three of the northern parishes; it started on the northern tier of parishes, but we have carried the work forward in some of the interior parishes, and the local people are expending the money for vats in order to educate the people in the value of the work.

Mr. HAWLEY. How soon do you expect this whole State to be covered by this compulsory dipping law?

Dr. DALRYMPLE. We want more Federal men, we want five more, I believe, now. The estimates for the Department of Agriculture were made up in September before the real facts in this case were known, I believe. Some of these gentlemen, I think, will be able to show you that a great many more men will be required than were thought necessary at that time. It is not a question of any department of the Government wanting this. We want it, the people of the South want it.

There you have got the State law in Louisiana, a compulsory law, compelling the people to dip their cattle. Why does the Government want to appropriate money when the State law has taken charge of them and compelled them to do their dipping? Now, I will turn to Dr. White, State veterinarian of Tennessee:

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Just one other question. You say you found the method of eradicating the ticks successful, and that it now is just a question of men and money?

Mr. WHITE. That is all there is to it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is quite a strong feeling prevailing that when the Government has demonstrated the method of eradicating the ticks and has shown the people just how it can be done, and that it is reducible to a question of time and money, that it is then up to the local people to do the work themselves.

Mr. WHITE. That is for you people to say.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What do you think of it?

Mr. WHITE. I do not think anything of it at all. I believe you folks ought to stay behind us and help us until we get out of it.

Mr. LEVER. Is it not a fact that the Government put you into it?

Mr. WHITE. They put us into it, and we want them to help us out.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Who put you in?

Mr. WHITE. The Federal Government put us in quarantine.

And now they want what? After dipping their cattle to destroy the ticks, and the Government has spent \$1,230,000, they want \$325,000 again, an increase of \$75,000 this year. The thing goes on, and every witness testifies along the same line, that it is a simple matter and that it can be done by the people.

In the State of Georgia they have a law, as stated in this hearing, fining every man who refuses to dip his cattle, and the evidence before the committee was that the law was enforced compelling the people to dip their cattle. If it is a good law in Georgia, it ought to be a good law in every State. It seems to me that if the people are furnished with the remedy for the disease, they ought to use it themselves.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman speaks of the matter as if the appropriation was intended for one or two States in particular.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no; I did not mean to be so understood.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understood the gentleman so in his reference to Tennessee and Louisiana. I want to ask if the Government experimented in other States?

Mr. BOOHER. I referred to the State of Georgia especially, where they have a law that compels them to dip their cattle, and other States might well follow the example of Georgia.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. I will.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I do not want to intrude on the gentleman, but perhaps his authority is incorrect, or the gentleman has by some lapsus designated Georgia instead of some other State. Whatever the witness may have said, there is no such law in Georgia. I do not mean to say that I do not think it would be a good law, but there is no such law there. The penal law applies only to the counties in Georgia now under quarantine, 14 in number, I believe. The other one hundred and thirty-odd counties are open to the ravages of the tick, and nothing done except on the volition of the cattle owners and no compulsory dipping law.

Mr. BOOHER. I will read what Dr. Bahnsen says:

Mr. LEVER. With this appropriation you are asking for, if the committee should allow it and Congress should allow it, how long would it take you to clean up this infested territory?

Mr. BAHNSEN. That was well stated by Dr. Dalrymple. If we get sufficient cooperation so we can extend this work, then there would be no need of prolonging the work of tick eradication. Under such cooperation the fever ticks ought to be eradicated from the entire country in less than five years, if we get after it as we should. It is merely a question of men and money.

Mr. HAWLEY. Have you the power, under the laws of the State of Georgia, to compel people to dip their cattle?

Mr. BAHNSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAWLEY. Suppose they do not dip, do you dip at their expense and charge it to them or do you destroy the cattle?

Mr. BAHNSEN. Our law gives us authority to quarantine their cattle and for compulsory dipping. If they fail to dip, we prosecute them for a misdemeanor, and I want to say that the courts have backed us up in each of the instances. Whenever we get a man before the courts for a violation of the quarantine law they never fail to fine him. Of course, the fines are merely nominal—\$10, \$15, or \$25, and costs—but we find in every instance it is sufficient to make them come right up.

Mr. HAWLEY. The people fined, then, have their cattle dipped?

Mr. BAHNSEN. Either that or they remove them without receiving a permit.

Mr. HAWLEY. I mean after you have prosecuted a man for not dipping his cattle and then he is fined, does he then dip his cattle?

Mr. BAHNSEN. Yes, sir; they do not fail to do it after they have been through court once.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. That is just what I want to bring out. We are under Federal statute and regulation; we are not under any State law. The Government authorities are authorized to fix the cattle-tick zone. Now, the extreme northeastern part of the State is in the cattle-tick zone. I apprehend that Dr. Bahnsen, in his testimony, had reference only to the counties in Georgia now under Government surveillance. The prosecution results from the Federal legislation or regulation that authorizes them to fix the tick quarantine zone. Seven-eighths, at least, of the State of Georgia is not within the tick-treatment zone, and very little dipping and no prosecutions in other parts of the State, presumably because it is not yet under Federal jurisdiction. I hope to see this appropriation made and the work extended.

Mr. BOOHER. I am reading from the testimony before the committee. Dr. Bahnsen says that they have a law in Georgia, and that it is enforced. If they have not got it, the witness made a mistake.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. He is correct, but his statement, without explanation, is susceptible of a misconception.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to show the difference between what the people down there do and what the people do in other localities for the same thing. In Kansas the people are threatened with a destruction of their wheat crops from chinch bugs. They did not come to Washington to get an appropriation from Congress to sprinkle something on the wheat. What did they do? Let me read. I took this from a newspaper. This is dated at Wichita, January 4:

A committee of grain men and millers' was appointed here to-day to organize the farmers of the Southwest to prevent the destruction of the 1913 crop by chinch bugs. Fields are to be burned over to kill the bugs. The weather has been so warm that the bugs are alive in the grassland and stubble fields.

The people of Kansas ought to have come to Congress and gotten an appropriation; they should have secured some expert from the department to go down there and teach them how to burn over their stubble fields. Mr. Chairman, the people ought to protect themselves. The Government has expended \$1,232,000 finding a means for destroying the ticks. They have furnished it to the people where these infected districts are. Two of the States have compulsory laws to compel dipping. Why do not the others have those laws. Take the sheep quarantine as an example. There is a quarantine against the western sheep. When they come into the stockyards of the country and you go there to buy your sheep, to take them out and feed them, you can not get them out of the stockyards without dipping, and what do you have to do? The man who buys the sheep is compelled to have them dipped in the presence of an expert, either from the State or from the Federal Government, and he has to pay for the dipping himself, at the rate of 3 cents a head.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. I want to ask if the gentleman does not misunderstand the theory of this appropriation. It is rather for the protection of those regions where the tick is unknown than for the extirpation of the tick directly—

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no.

Mr. TAGGART. Inasmuch as cattle infested with that tick will cause certain death to other cattle just as soon as the tick leaves them and goes onto the sound cattle.

Mr. BOOHER. My friend from Kansas knows that they have a quarantine against these cattle and they can not get them to market in certain seasons without complying with the quarantine laws.

Mr. TAGGART. Rather than run the risk of that, we are willing to pay our share of this, if we can extirpate the tick.

Mr. BOOHER. Then we ought to pay our share for eradicating every disease that is known to man and animals alike, and then we ought to make an appropriation for everything that somebody imagines is the matter with him, and we ought to make an appropriation of a million dollars for hog cholera. That is just as important as this matter, and more so. The loss from that, largely, is more than from the cattle tick. Yet when they discover means to prevent hog cholera or a cure for it, if I were in Congress I would vote against an appropriation of a single dollar to send men out to do the work the farmer should do for himself. When the remedy is furnished by the Government let the farmer follow directions and do it himself. A few years ago in my country they had an epidemic of black-leg among young cattle. They did not appeal to the Government for experts to go there and doctor their cattle. The Government found a serum that would cure it and furnished it to the States, and the cattle raisers bought it and used it themselves, without the benefit or advice of any expert. I hope this appropriation will be stricken from the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with some interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri, but the fact remains that the Government has at its expense found a remedy that will destroy the cattle ticks that not only infest the Southern States but that threaten to infest other States if these cattle are shipped to them. The Government knows this and it has quarantined the tick-infested section of the country against the shipment of their cattle. Now, to say that the Government shall stop its aid in cooperation with the States toward the destruction of the cattle tick in that section of the country will simply be saying to us keep your cattle on that side of the line, you can not ship them into other sections of this great country. I want to say that the Government will not take that backward step. This section will keep up this operation until the cattle tick is wiped off the face of the map. One hundred and sixty-five thousand square miles have already been relieved of the cattle tick by means of the dipping process brought to us by the Federal Government. Understand, it is not the Southern States alone who are interested in this great proposition, but you can take every State in this Union where the people are now denied meat for their table because of the exorbitant price that must be paid for it, and it is in the interest of the great mass of American people that we plead for this appropriation that the great breeding grounds of the South may be used to graze cattle that may go into every market in the world.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I have not the time—only five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Just for a question.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Go ahead.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman just voted against the proposition to appropriate \$200,000 additional for the prevention of hog cholera.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I want to say to the gentleman that when the Government gets beyond the experimental stage in the matter of the hog-cholera proposition and has reached the successful remedy, as in the cattle-tick proposition, I will vote \$200,000 and even \$325,000. [Applause.] I am for something that has already been proven. I voted for the \$45,000 that we may advance the work on hog cholera, as the cattle-tick work has passed beyond experiment to a demonstrated fact. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my State a part of it is above the quarantine line and a part of it below the quarantine line, and the people of my own State are spending of their own funds hundreds of dollars making these dipping vats, and I have seen thousands of head of cattle in my own county driven through them that the tick might be eradicated, as it is eradicated. When we come with the proposition that the Government has entered on this work so successfully now, shall we take a backward step? As is shown by the hearings read here, the western country, from where the cattle used to come in great herds, are going into agricultural interests. In my own State it is

going into agricultural interests, and we must have breeding grounds for our cattle. What better breeding grounds can we find, so far as the soil, the climate, than in that section of the country where the boll weevil has increased? And what greater work can be done in those Southern States than to continue this successful work till the cattle tick shall be a thing of ancient history? We must wipe it out, and why not wipe it out at one fell swoop, as our committee thought we could do by this appropriation? [Applause.] Think of it, Mr. Chairman! Within the past six years there has been a decrease of 10,000,000 head in our cattle supply. No wonder the high price of our meat products. It is suicidal not to conserve this great industry, and Congress ought not to be guilty of the folly of striking the one fatal blow that of necessity further adds to the shortage of this great source of wealth. This appropriation should remain intact.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the motion made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] to strike out the paragraph ought not to prevail. I agree with him heartily in part in what he has said to the effect that after the Government has experimented and learned the means and methods by which the disease may be prevented or cured, and it comes merely to the question of men and money, the local people ought to bear all or a large part of the expense. I have offered an amendment—it is in the hands of the reading clerk to be read—which I think will perfect this section and make it unobjectionable. This paragraph calls for \$325,000. My amendment would forbid the use of any portion of that money in the purchase of materials for or in the construction of dipping vats upon land the title of which is not in the United States, except at fairs or expositions where the Department of Agriculture makes an exhibit or a demonstration; and that no part of this money shall be used in the purchase of material for the mixture used in the vats, except when used for the purpose of experimenting or demonstration under the charge or direction of the Bureau of Animal Industry. Now, it seems to me that with the adoption of that amendment, with the qualification and limitation of the department in the use of this money, the objection made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] would be overcome. A portion of this money has been used in an objectionable way in the building of vats upon private property, a work that ought to be done by the private individual, an expense that ought to be borne entirely by him.

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the gentleman think if his amendment prevails that the amount carried by the bill ought to be reduced?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know; I am not well enough informed about that; but gentlemen in charge of the bill can tell of the work to be done by the bureau under this appropriation. As has been said by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young], large sections of the country have been quarantined and no shipment of cattle from them to other sections is permitted. There must be inspection; agents of the bureau are required for that. When these sections are released certificates have to be issued. There is considerable work and a considerable expense in that line, but, in my judgment, money should be spent only for that purpose and for giving instruction where it has not already been given.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think the limitation my amendment would place on the use of this money would make the paragraph proper; we can fix the amount later.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman does not think, does he, that you can use it for anything else than eradicating the southern cattle tick? You can not use it for quarantine purposes?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think it can be so used. I think a part of the money heretofore appropriated is used for inspection and quarantining and the issuing of certificates for releasing territory that has been freed from the pest.

Mr. BOOHER. Is there not a provision for cattle inspectors for the express purpose of inspecting the cattle?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes. But part of this money is used for that purpose too.

Mr. BOOHER. I do not think you can divert that money from the purposes mentioned in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be read and be pending before the committee while the other amendment is under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the only amendment before the committee is the amendment of the gentleman

from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] to strike out the paragraph. The vote is on that amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BOOHER. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 4, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I now offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 11, at the end of line 14, by inserting the following:
"Provided, however, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the purchase of materials for or in the construction of dipping vats upon land not owned solely by the United States, except at fairs or expositions where the Department of Agriculture makes exhibits or demonstrations; nor shall any part of this appropriation be used in the purchase of materials or mixtures for use in dipping vats except in experimental or demonstration work carried on by the officials or agents of the Bureau of Animal Industry."

Mr. LAMB. That is already a part of the law, I think. I will not object to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that all debate on the paragraph and the amendment thereto has been closed.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for scientific investigations in diseases of animals, including the maintenance and improvement of the bureau experiment station at Bethesda, Md., and the necessary alterations of buildings thereon, and the necessary expenses for investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, \$78,680.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not find anything in the hearings relating to this paragraph or I did not succeed in getting the hearings relating to it. How many acres in this farm at Bethesda, Md.?

Mr. LAMB. This is an experimental farm out here of about 60 or 70 acres, possibly more—

Mr. COX. It seems that \$78,680 is a tremendous amount of money to be expended on a farm of that size.

Mr. LAMB. There is where they develop the serum; there is where they experiment with it, and a good deal of this appropriation is for burning up buildings that have been infected or diseased by cattle. This experimental work in diseases of hogs and cattle is carried on at this farm.

Mr. COX. You say that there are 60 or 70 acres in that farm?

Mr. LAMB. Yes.

Mr. COX. What becomes of this tremendous sum of money—\$78,680? How is that expended? In the way of salaries?

Mr. LAMB. Salaries constitute a good deal of it—indeed, the largest part of the appropriation.

Mr. COX. In that connection I would like to ask the gentleman if a large amount of this \$78,000 in this item does not go for increases of salary?

Mr. LAMB. I will look up the salary account, but I would like to say to my friend in the meantime, by way of parenthesis, that if he will take a car and go there and look at it he will see exactly what it is.

Mr. COX. I have not got the time to go out there at this time to see about it. I want to know the general character of the work. I find on the next page an item for \$16,500 for the construction of a building down there, making a total of over \$95,000 to be expended in the coming year on that farm.

Mr. LAMB. I will give the gentleman an itemized account of it. I have it here among my papers.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] is looking up the exact appropriations for the different lines of work at that experiment station I desire to say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] that under this item the work at Bethesda, Md., is carried on. They own something like 60 acres of land out there, and they are carrying on the work of studying the various diseases that afflict the various species of farm animals of the country. They are engaged in preparing serums, toxins, tuberculin and other remedies that are designed to prevent the spread of contagious diseases among farm animals.

Most of this money, I will say to the gentleman, is being expended in the way of salaries and in the way of alteration of buildings, the fumigation of buildings, and sometimes the tearing down of buildings that have become infected and the construction of other buildings in which to take care of the animals upon which they are experimenting. It is one of the most interesting places near the city of Washington, and I would be glad if sometime my friend would go out there and see the enormous amount of scientific and investigational work that they are doing.

They are studying the problem of tuberculosis in cattle, with a view of developing whether milk or butter or cream will convey the tuberculosis germ from the cow to the human family. They are studying hog cholera and chicken cholera. They are studying the problem of inbreeding and a number of other problems connected with animal husbandry in the country.

Mr. COX. Do I understand the gentleman to say that they go out and buy animals for this purpose and experiment with them?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly. They must have animals to experiment with; for instance, they take a hog and inject into it cholera virus, and give the hog a good case of cholera; or they will take a cow and infect it with cattle tick and see if they can obtain a remedy for that disease. It is all work done for the benefit of human kind. It is one of the most important branches of the work done by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COX. What is the connection between Bethesda farm, in Maryland, and that at Beltsville?

Mr. LEVER. The Beltsville farm is a piece of land of about 400 acres, about 14 miles from the Capitol, out in Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more for the purpose of getting information about this 100-acre farm.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. What do they do at the Beltsville farm?

Mr. LAMB. Let us take up one farm at a time.

Mr. LEVER. If my friend from Virginia will permit me, I will say to the gentleman that I took a trip up to Beltsville not long since. They are studying at Beltsville the problems of dairying, largely. They are making an effort to find a model farm for the average dairyman in the United States. They are studying the problem of milk. They are studying the problem of silos, whether they should be built out of wood or built out of cement. They are studying the proper kind of food for their cattle and their calves. They are studying the entire problem of dairying with a view at some time in the future of issuing a bulletin to the dairy farmers in the United States which will give them information as to the best and most practical and profitable kind of dairy that they can run.

Mr. COX. Do they produce any revenue to the Government from this work?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman give us any idea of how much this farm produced last year?

Mr. LEVER. I can not give the exact amount that is produced there, but I know that the health department here is receiving milk from the Beltsville dairy. In addition to that, they are studying the problem of poultry breeding, and hog breeding, and all the various problems connected with the farm, including problems relating to cattle. Everything that is killed or can be sold there is sold, and the revenues therefrom are turned into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. COX. It is nothing like self-sustaining, is it?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, of course not. You can not expect any scientific investigation to be self-sustaining. It is not intended to be such.

Mr. COX. Is any part of this appropriation here used for the purpose of increasing salaries?

Mr. LEVER. I think not.

Mr. LAMB. There is a statement of salaries, and I will say to the gentleman that on pages 24 and 25 you will find an itemized account of everything that is expended there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more. This is an important subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. I read from the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. I want to say that committee is doing fine work. This is a statement, made before that committee, of the manner in which this appropriation is expended:

Expended from the lump-fund appropriation "General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, 1912 (diseases of animals)," during the period between July 1, 1911, and June 30, 1912.

For investigations and experiments in the study of animal diseases, with a view of developing methods for the eradication and control thereof.....	\$12,858.20
For experiments and investigations in the study of hog cholera, and for conducting experiments concerning the practical application of anthrax-cholera serum for combating hog cholera.....	9,172.73

For experiments and investigations in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Live Stock Sanitary Board in the study of milk hygiene	\$1,387.40
For miscellaneous investigations and experiments in studying infectious animal diseases	3,742.55
For investigations of the frozen and desiccated egg industries, with special reference to the bacterial content of the finished products and the sources of contamination	1,939.52
For miscellaneous experiments and investigations in the study of roundworms, gid, and tapeworms in sheep, parasites of hogs, and measles of sheep and cattle, and the treatment of cattle mange	10,245.77
For repairs, improvements, and general maintenance of the Experiment Station, Bethesda, Md., and for conducting experiments and investigations there concerning the study of tuberculosis, Texas fever, and other diseases of animals	30,691.57
Total expenditures under the appropriation for diseases of animals	70,037.74

Mr. COX. That was last year's appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. That was last year's appropriation; and this appropriation is like last year's appropriation.

Mr. LAMB. Now, let me say in reply to the question that was asked a while ago, the whole increase of salaries in this bureau amounts to \$280—that is, outside of the inspection of cattle and hogs.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general administrative work, including traveling expenses and salaries of employees engaged in such work, rent outside of the District of Columbia, office fixtures and supplies, express, freight, telegraph, telephone, and other necessary expenses, \$40,186.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, after line 8, page 12, by inserting a new paragraph, as follows:

"For all necessary expenses for experiment in the feeding and breeding of ostriches and for investigations and experiments in the study of the ostrich industry, \$2,500."

Mr. LAMB. I reserve the point of order on that.

[Mr. HAYDEN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to know what the point of order of the gentleman from Virginia is.

Mr. LAMB. I make the point of order that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAMB) there were—ayes 25, noes 17.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry: For additional expenses in carrying out the provisions of the meat-inspection act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. L., p. 674), there is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the sum of \$200,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph and would like to know the necessity for it.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, this is a new item—an increase of \$200,000. The increase is needed to efficiently carry on meat inspection, not only because the work is expanding, but also because with the sum now provided, \$3,000,000, proper increases in salaries can not be made to experienced employees. The total number of employees is about 2,400. The average salary is low. It is impossible to properly conduct the inspection without retaining in the service these experienced and, therefore, most valuable employees. Unless promotions are made many of these employees will leave the service, and their places will necessarily be filled by others, inexperienced and more or less inefficient. If the gentleman will examine the hearings on this matter, he will find that we interrogated Dr. Melvin and his assistant about it. They stated the number of men that were employed, and that it was necessary in order to carry on this work that this increase should be made. I want to say that we cut the sum down from the amount estimated.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I read the hearings, and I do not know whether the position taken by Dr. Melvin is correct. That is to say, that this money is needed in order to hold these employees.

Mr. LAMB. That is a part of it.

Mr. COX. How much of this \$200,000 will go to increase the salary of employees? As a matter of fact, does not practically all of it go there?

Mr. LAMB. The bulk of it, I think, will, because that is what it is for. They have 2,400 employees. They have a brigade of men employed in this important work that touches the homes of so many people.

Mr. COX. Does not 90 per cent of it go to increase the salaries of the employees?

Mr. LAMB. I think so.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman contend that there is any law on which to base this appropriation?

Mr. LAMB. There is law for the \$3,000,000 to carry on the work, and the same authority that made the \$3,000,000 to do this work can add \$200,000 to it.

Mr. COX. But I ask the gentleman if there is any law for this increase?

Mr. LAMB. No particular law for the increase; no.

Mr. MANN. There is the law providing for the inspection.

Mr. LAMB. That is the law creating the department, and we are the lawmaking body, and we can make the law.

Mr. COX. How many new places are to be made with this \$200,000 appropriation?

Mr. LAMB. I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Very few.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman give us any idea how many new places will be created?

Mr. LAMB. I did not ask Dr. Melvin. I trust him, and I think this House can trust him.

Mr. COX. I do not remember Dr. Melvin being asked that question.

Mr. LAMB. We did not ask him.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] will permit, Dr. Melvin's testimony does not appear in the printed hearings. When the committee reached his bureau in its order in taking up the estimates, Dr. Melvin was in the West, and Dr. Farrington, the next in rank, appeared before the committee. Later on, however, the subcommittee took up the whole proposition with Dr. Melvin. That testimony was not taken stenographically. My recollection of his testimony is that there were some eight or ten or perhaps a dozen packing houses to which he desired to extend the meat-inspection service, and that would take probably 25 per cent of the appropriation asked for.

Mr. COX. That is the extension work.

Mr. LEVER. And the appropriation asked for was \$300,000. The committee allowed only \$200,000. I take it that something like \$150,000 of the \$200,000 appropriated here will be used in the promotion of employees in the inspection service.

Mr. COX. And in the increase of salaries?

Mr. LEVER. In the promotion and increase of the salaries at the top of the line in order that men at the bottom of the line may be moved up and given a reasonable salary.

Mr. COX. And the other \$50,000 for the extension of the work?

Mr. LEVER. I give that as an estimate, from my recollection of the testimony.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will permit, I will state that Dr. Melvin stated there were now 940 packing houses and 8 or 10 new packing houses asking for this service, and he said it required about \$100,000 to meet the requirements of this extension work, and \$200,000 was intended for the increase, which makes \$100,000 available for increase of salaries and \$100,000 for taking care of this work.

Mr. LAMB. And probably Dr. Melvin was expending the money upon that basis.

Mr. LEVER. I regard this as a very meritorious proposition. The gentleman from Indiana knows, of course, that the meat-inspection law carries a total appropriation of \$3,000,000. That is a permanent law. They have run that appropriation the past fiscal year within \$20,000. That is skating on thin ice to keep men out of the penitentiary. No promotions have been made in the last six years, I believe. No examinations have been held for any inspectors in the last six years. These men work down there standing in blood half knee deep, and go through the horrid process of examining these animals from day to day and hour to hour, working 10 and 14 hours a day, and I believe they are entitled to some promotion and some consideration from this House.

Mr. COX. Let me ask this question there. Is not there some way of incorporating in this bill some time in the future this compensation and salaries so that Members of the House could get at it? Now, here is a lump-sum appropriation of practically \$3,000,000 from which these employees are paid. I would like to see it in the bill itself. It would not make the bill very cumbersome.

Mr. LAMB. Get the Book of Estimates and look and see for yourself, and I will say to the gentleman that all of this money is used for the salaries and traveling expenses, and that is the sum total of this whole thing.

Mr. COX. I quite agree with the gentleman in that, so far as traveling expenses are concerned, because the travel is \$358,000 for the Bureau of Animal Industry alone.

Mr. MANN. It is not necessary to get the Book of Estimates, because under the law the Secretary of Agriculture is required to make a report annually, which he does—

Mr. COX. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Giving in detail the expenditures and salaries.

Mr. LEVER. And that is in the report of the committee—

Mr. BOOHER. May I ask the gentleman a question? Now, as I understand, the intention is that this amount is to be applied wholly to promotions?

Mr. LEVER. No; the intention is that it is to be applied, part to the additional service and part to the increase in the salaries of employees.

Mr. BOOHER. What proportion do you estimate will be applied to promotions and paying better salaries?

Mr. LAMB. I do not understand that over \$50,000 or \$75,000, but my friend from Iowa disagrees and thinks about \$100,000 will be used for the purpose of extending the service and \$100,000 for the promotion of employees.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is the statement made by Dr. Melvin before the committee.

Mr. LAMB. I think the gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. BOOHER. Will these promotions be made from the lower grades?

Mr. LEVER. These promotions are to be made from the lower grades. It is a meritorious proposition, and I hope nobody will make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me just a second. A large number of these employees entered the service some years ago under a schedule which was announced by the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture stating that certain increases of salary would be made after a certain length of service.

Men went into the service with the statement from the Department of Agriculture that under the \$3,000,000 appropriation, after a year or two years or different years, that promotions would be made and increases of salaries would be made. And that could be done under the \$3,000,000 appropriation if there had not been such an extension of the service made necessary by the new packing houses throughout the country. In order to give the service to the packing houses, the Secretary was unable to carry out the pledge that was made to these employees for any increase. They are now threatened with a wholesale resignation of employees, and probably it would be an impossibility at present to obtain men with sufficient knowledge to do this work.

Mr. LAMB. They lost 200 last year, I will say.

Mr. MANN. Many of these men are required to be expert veterinarians, having passed an examination as veterinary surgeons after going through veterinary colleges; and the salaries are very small, in any event.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, the only way we can extend this service on the one hand and give these men who have been working at a low salary for six years any increase at all is to allow the appropriation in this bill to stand.

Mr. COX. In this extension work they only propose to extend it, do they not, in factories where commodities enter into interstate commerce?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly. There are some 8 or 10 of those where they desire to extend the service.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask most earnestly that the point of order be withdrawn and the objection waived. There is an impression that these men are all employed in one or two places. Let me call your attention to the fact that there are now in the employ of the Government 2,374 of these employees. They are performing their duties in 940 different establishments, that are located in 259 different towns and cities, and that the highest wages paid to an ordinary meat inspector is \$100 a month; that an assistant meat inspector is paid \$1,000 a year, as the highest wages, but the great bulk of them are working at \$840 a year. The figures show that but 282 of these inspectors are getting \$1,200, 31 are getting \$1,100, and some 644 are receiving \$1,000 a year. Three hundred and thirteen of them are working for \$840 per annum. They are really in charge of one of the most important duties that is performed by this Government. It is their duty to see to it that unwholesome meats that might communicate diseases to one-half of the people of the United States that now use and consume the meats which are inspected by these men do not enter into interstate commerce. Of course, no institution that does not do interstate commerce can be inspected by the Government. There is a demand by the people for this inspection, and it is difficult to get men of intelligence and character who will stay there in the blood and in the horrible surroundings of a meat inspector from day to day for less wages than are ordinarily paid for scientific work. The majority of men

could not stand it. It is a great injustice to require men to work for \$840 a year at such work as that. All of this appropriation will not be used—

Mr. COX. How many hours a day do they work?

Mr. TAGGART. They work indefinitely. It depends on the work in hand.

Mr. COX. How many days leave of absence do they have in a year?

Mr. TAGGART. Fifteen, I think; perhaps 30.

Mr. COX. Do they have any sick leave?

Mr. TAGGART. Yes; if a man is too sick to work.

Mr. COX. Do they have any sick leave for which they are paid?

Mr. TAGGART. No; I do not think so.

Mr. COX. How many days do they put in?

Mr. TAGGART. They put in as many days as the establishment works.

Mr. COX. They are not required to work on Sunday?

Mr. TAGGART. Not ordinarily. I do not think they do any work on Sunday.

Mr. COX. They put in 313 days less their leave of absence, whatever that might amount to?

Mr. LEVER. Fifteen days as against 30 days here in Washington.

Mr. TAGGART. One of those inspectors working in one of those great packing houses going at its full capacity will inspect a beef in 48 seconds. That is one of the reasons the service ought to be extended. A beef is slaughtered every 48 seconds in one of those great packing houses.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, I have watched these men in the packing houses and, as I recollect, they stand right at the point of slaughter, do they not?

Mr. TAGGART. Yes; they do.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is a very disagreeable job, and as I watched them it struck me that they not only had to be very agile, but also very expert, as the carcass goes along, to detect tuberculosis.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, let no man understand that they are a rough class of men who have that work to perform. They pass a civil-service examination, and a large number of them are very intelligent young men.

Mr. COX. Are there any eligibles on the waiting list for those jobs at the present time?

Mr. TAGGART. There is no examination except the civil-service examination which they have to undergo.

Mr. COX. Somebody said that some of these men have quit. I want to know if the Government has had any trouble in filling the vacancies.

Mr. TAGGART. They fill the vacancies that occur with such men as they can get.

Mr. LEVER. There is no more trouble in filling vacancies there than there would be in filling vacancies in Congress, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Is it not true that these men not only have to pass an examination but they have to be graduates of certain colleges before they can take the examination?

Mr. LAMB. That is the case with the veterinarians. They have to do that.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think that unless this \$200,000 appropriation is allowed, long-delayed justice will be withheld from a class of men who have been giving the Government a service that is far in excess of the compensation they have received. There is no work in the Government service more arduous or where more painstaking care must be had than in this service.

In the great packing houses of Chicago the men employed as Government meat inspectors work from 12 to 16 hours a day. There is no regulation as to what number of hours they shall be employed. Before they go into the service in many cases they must have been graduated as veterinary surgeons, and those who are now in the lower grades in this great service have been in the service at the same rate of pay for more than six years.

For \$840 per annum the men in this service are doing a work that is paid almost double that amount by private enterprise. There is no reason why the Government of the United States should not be as good an employer as a private employer is.

These men are high-class men. They are educated for the particular work that they are called upon to do. They devote a number of years of their lives to learning the business in which they are about to engage, and what they learn is of no use whatever to them if they leave the Government service, whereas a man who learns a trade and engages in private employment can find a number of places where he can get a job if he is turned out of work by any one concern. So that it seems

to me there is more reason than ever before for giving due consideration to these men.

If you make a point of order against this provision in the bill, it would not only do a great injustice to a worthy class of men, but it would retard in a large sense the extension of the inspection service to the new houses that have been constructed since the last appropriation bill was passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit me to ask him a question there?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois concede that there is no authority of law for this?

Mr. MADDEN. No; on the contrary, I believe there is authority of law for it. In the first place, the Congress of the United States, when the inspection law was enacted, made a permanent appropriation of \$3,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything in that law that will prohibit Congress from making an additional appropriation?

Mr. MADDEN. No. On the contrary, I believe that the law then gave ample power to Congress to increase the appropriation from time to time to meet the growing needs of the service.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing pending before the committee; simply a point of order has been reserved.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I entertain no doubt that the item is subject to a point of order, under the facts elicited by the answers of the members of the committee reporting the bill, to the questions which have been propounded to them.

I do not want to do these employees or any other employees any injustice. While it has been disclosed that a large number of them, 200 or 230 of them, have quit within the last year, that fact does not appeal to me, because I have always clung to the idea throughout my life, and I think I will to the end, that a man is to a large extent the architect of his own fortune and can choose his own profession and calling in life. I do not know why these men quit this employment, but the chances are that they sought out better and more remunerative employment, and quit for that reason. We have no assurance whatever that if this appropriation is permitted to stand and these employees go ahead and become more and more efficient and useful to the Government as inspectors, that private employment in the course of another year will not take them from the Government of the United States. I know of no rule and no law that Congress could pass that could ever prohibit that. We have that to contend with practically in every department of this Government, and always will have it to contend with, that the wage earner will seek the place where he can get the most for his labor. So, as I say, that argument does not appeal to me.

Neither do some other arguments appeal to me, because I take it that the Government is easily able to fill these places. I have nothing to base this statement upon, other than facts which have come to my notice heretofore, but I undertake to say that now there are a large number of men waiting upon the eligible list to take these places.

But for fear that I might do an injustice to some deserving employees, and for the further reason that it might cripple the Government in this extension work, I will withdraw my point of order at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire further to reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to be heard for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. If there is any subject that is of interest to mankind, which needs a thorough, scientific investigation, I think it is the meat that is offered for sale in the American market. I do not know what is the cause, neither have I been able to learn why the inspection has not revealed the reason the meats on our markets to-day are in such a deplorable and, I say, unwholesome condition. You can scarcely go to the market and buy a cured ham but what it looks you in the face and tells you that it is your deadly enemy as soon as you place it on the table. If these men who have been inspecting the meats of this country are not scientific men, then I say the Government ought to replace them with a good corps of experts. If their salaries are inadequate to enable them to discharge that high and most necessary duty of inspecting the meats of this country, their salaries ought to be increased so that they may devote their time solely to this most important subject.

While I am on the floor I desire to ask my friend who has just made a speech upon this question, my colleague, the gentleman from Chicago, Mr. MADDEN, if these inspectors inspect any other kind of meat than the live animal, to see whether it is diseased just before slaughter.

Mr. MADDEN. They inspect both before and after killing.

Mr. FOWLER. Do they inspect the methods of curing and packing?

Mr. MADDEN. They inspect the whole thing from start to finish.

Mr. FOWLER. Do they inspect the storage of meat in cold-storage houses in the great centers?

Mr. MADDEN. I am not sure about that.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to see the greatest experts in this or any other country put on the heels of these cold-storage people.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is usually correct in his statements of fact which he makes here upon this floor, but I would like to have some authority for the statement he makes that the meats which are sent out by this country are diseased. I do not believe the statement is correct.

Mr. FOWLER. I state what I do know from personal experience. I do not believe that there is a cured ham in the city of Washington or on the American market but what is injured by chemicals which have been injected into it, unless it has been cured on the farm by the old common-sense method of smoking it with sassafras and hickory.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Or with corncobs.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; and with corncobs.

Mr. JACKSON. I assume that the gentleman is an eater of ham, and yet he looks healthy.

Mr. FOWLER. I have taken a small portion within the last day, and it is from this experience that I am talking on the ham question now.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman does not mean to have us infer that his statement comes from indigestion?

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all; but I repeat that if there is a subject that I would go further in making appropriations of money it is on the subject of the inspection of meats in this country. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that the statement of the gentleman from Illinois ought not to go unchallenged.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. SLOAN. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I make a point of order that that comes too late.

Mr. SLOAN. Then, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement of two or three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the privilege of making a statement, so that the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] shall not go unchallenged. He practically charged that the meat products of our farms throughout the United States are unhealthful and unmarketable. I challenge the correctness of that statement, and the gentleman ought not to have made it.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I do not yield.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to say to the gentleman he ought to be fair.

Mr. SLOAN. I do not desire a lecture from the gentleman from Illinois. I am talking of a subject here that is important to the American people, because the products of our farms are largely reduced to meats, and we depend on the markets of America and the world to effect good sales. I think before the gentleman from Illinois says that our hams or meats, or anything else, are diseased, unclean, or anything of that kind, he should have made use of the information which was within his reach, and is within the reach of every Member of the House. The Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department of this House during the last session took evidence day in and day out on the subject, and the evidence is there, clear and unmistakable, so that he who runs may read, that the meat inspection in this country is practically efficient, and that the large bulk of our beef and pork products, going to every part of the United States and the world, is pure, healthful, and fit to be put upon any market in any city or country in the world. [Applause.] It ill becomes a Member of this House to slander the products of America's greatest industry in the way that the gentleman has done. [Applause.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two and a half minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks to proceed for two and a half minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] certainly was asleep while I made my statement. All of the meats that come from the farm were alluded to by the "gentleman from Illinois" as being wholesome, because they had smelt the smoke of the corncocks, the sassafras, and the hickory wood. [Applause.] It is the method which is known as "the quick method" of curing meats in this country, and the long ages meats are kept in cold storage that I allude to as being unwholesome. I charge now that such methods are unwholesome and stand in need of the severest and most scrutinizing inspection.

I dare say if the gentleman has smelled the odor from the beef, the birds, and other meats coming from cold storage and has not been in the attitude of leaving the table to keep from holding his nose, he is the only man I know of who has not had such experience.

The gentleman talks about the meats of this country being wholesome in the packing house, and yet he stands here and asks for an appropriation of \$200,000 to get a more efficient inspection of our meats. Ah, "consistency, thou art a jewel." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that the gentleman from Nebraska never asked for \$200,000 appropriation, and the gentleman from Illinois knows it. I have not been asleep. I admit that the gentleman's speeches are the greatest anesthetic known, surpassing ether and chloroform, but he did not put me to sleep this afternoon. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, \$1,969,696.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] just stated that when beefsteak was put on the table in his experience he had to hold his nose.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not eat any of it—no.

Mr. MANN. I am very glad to say that I do not find that experience at my boarding house. I think that the gentleman, instead of casting aspersions upon the meat of the country, to be sent out broadcast over the world, better change his boarding house. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman a question before he concludes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask the gentleman if he knows that I am living at home in Washington [laughter], and that it might be unprofitable for me to leave my home?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman is living at home, for his statement that he is living at home is a refutation of his former statement that he had to hold his nose at the table.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that birds and meats are put on the table which are so nauseating that a man is loath to eat them and more anxious to hold his nose than to eat?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will put myself up as an object lesson, being fairly fat and eating well, dining out and in, at the boarding house and everywhere, as against my colleague from Illinois. I never found that experience. I regret that my friend from Illinois constantly goes to places where they give him something to eat which is not fit to eat. I do not have that experience.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to my colleague that on the train only a few months ago—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. FOWLER. That there was served—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry: One plant physiologist and pathologist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,500; 1 executive assistant in seed distribution, \$2,250; 1 officer in charge of publications, \$2,200; 1 landscape gardener, \$1,800; 1 officer in charge of records, \$2,100; 1 superintendent of seed weighing and mailing, \$2,000; 1 executive clerk, \$2,250; 3 executive clerks, at \$1,980 each; 1 assistant superintendent of seed warehouse, \$1,400; 1 seed inspector, \$1,000; 9 clerks, class 4; 11 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at \$1,500 each; 17 clerks, class 2; 49 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 9 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 31 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 51 clerks, at \$900 each; 24 clerks, at \$840 each; 15 clerks, at \$720 each; 36 messengers, gardeners, or laborers, at \$720 each; 11 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$660 each; 20 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each;

1 artist, \$1,620; 1 clerk or artist, \$1,200; 1 assistant in illustrations, \$840; 1 photographer, \$1,400; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 1 photographer, \$900; 1 laboratory aid, \$1,440; 1 laboratory aid, \$1,380; 3 laboratory aids, at \$1,200 each; 1 laboratory aid, \$1,080; 2 laboratory aids, at \$1,020 each; 5 laboratory aids, at \$840 each; 8 laboratory aids, at \$720 each; 6 laboratory aids, at \$600 each; 1 laboratory apprentice, \$720; 2 map tracers, at \$720 each; 1 map tracer, \$600; 1 gardener, \$1,440; 2 gardeners, at \$1,200 each; 1 gardener, \$1,100; 2 gardeners or assistants, at \$1,000 each; 7 gardeners, at \$900 each; 4 gardeners, at \$840 each; 4 gardeners, at \$780 each; 8 gardeners, at \$720 each; 5 gardeners, at \$660 each; 2 gardeners, at \$600 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$960; 1 skilled laborer, \$900; 4 skilled laborers or gardeners, at \$840 each; 1 assistant in technology, \$1,400; 1 assistant in technology, \$1,380; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,200; 1 blacksmith, \$900; 1 carpenter, \$900; 1 painter, \$900; 1 teamster, \$840; 1 teamster, \$600; 19 laborers, at \$540 each; 24 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 5 laborers or charwomen, at \$480 each; 2 laborers or charwomen, at \$360 each; 2 laborers, at \$420 each; 8 charwomen, at \$240 each; 8 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 3 messenger boys, at \$300 each; in all, \$418,920.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves all points of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee why it is that the salary of the chief of the bureau has been increased?

Mr. LAMB. Since when, does the gentleman mean? We did not increase any salaries.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the salary of the chief of that bureau was originally fixed at \$3,000?

Mr. LAMB. I do not know. That is further back than I have gone.

Mr. FOWLER. And that the chief clerk's salary was fixed at \$2,000?

Mr. LAMB. I do not know. The gentleman seems to have been looking into ancient history. Let us know.

Mr. FOWLER. I am asking for the reason for the increase.

Mr. LAMB. It is because we think the laborer is worthy of his hire.

Mr. FOWLER. Then why did you not increase the salaries of some of these laboring people who are getting as low as \$360 a year?

Mr. LAMB. Last year we increased 158 of them.

Mr. FOWLER. And I see in the bill—in the paragraph—provision is made for laborers at \$240 a year—charwomen.

Mr. LAMB. Well, they are charwomen who go there part of the day, just like charwomen in the office buildings. I presume the gentleman heard the discussion on the floor the other day with reference to that.

Mr. FOWLER. They told me they worked four or five hours a day. These women waited on me recently and told me they worked four or five hours a day.

Mr. EDWARDS. Which women are those?

Mr. FOWLER. The charwomen. Why did you increase the salaries of these big offices and fail to increase the little ones?

Mr. LAMB. Because of the difference in the work of a charwoman and the work of the chief of a division of the Department of Agriculture; for the same reason that the gentleman does not increase his employees at home in proportion to his salary here; because the gentleman is worth so much more than they are.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman is speaking from imagination, I assume.

Mr. LAMB. No; the fact is you are here and you are getting a \$7,500 salary, whereas your man at home probably gets \$25 a month.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask the gentleman why he has increased the salary of the officer in charge of publications from \$2,000 to \$2,200?

Mr. LAMB. This is a promotion of \$200 for an officer who handles all the publications of the bureau, prepares all manuscript for transmission to the Division of Publications, where they are officially revised before being sent to the Government Printer, and so forth. We could give a whole lot of reasons. He has not had a promotion in seven years.

Mr. FOWLER. I see the officer in charge of records has been increased from \$2,000 to \$2,100.

Mr. LAMB. This is an increase of \$100 in the salary of this officer, who handles all financial matters of the bureau and who directs the handling of a sum aggregating over two and a quarter million dollars, and sees that 35 or 36 officers are regularly informed as to the status of their funds.

Mr. FOWLER. How many hours a day do these people put in?

Mr. LAMB. I suppose about eight or nine.

Mr. FOWLER. Do they not put in seven?

Mr. LAMB. Men like these, charged with the responsibility of this sort, work like Congressmen, until 7 or 8 o'clock at night.

Mr. FOWLER. I will ask if it is not a fact they only put in about seven hours a day?

Mr. LAMB. It is not, I think.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the gentleman information upon this question?

Mr. LAMB. Yes; I have been there and seen them at all hours of the day. I spent a month down there once from early in the morning until dewy eve.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Will not my colleague from Illinois take into consideration the fact that the volume of work turned out by this office has increased very largely on account of the increased demands of agriculture—

Mr. FOWLER. That is true.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Which annually puts more work under them? Now, the individual employee does not have to do any more work, but the manager or superintendent of this division, who must measure the energies and activities to meet the growth of it—

Mr. FOWLER. If the gentleman has read this paragraph, he must have seen the wonderful increase in the number of people who have been added to this great force for the purpose of meeting the increased demands on this department.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. That is the very point I wanted to make to my colleague, that the superintendent of the division in charge of it has increased not only his responsibility and the details of the work which are a charge against—

Mr. FOWLER. He has subordinates to look after those.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. That is quite true. I know my colleague knows that the superintendent here gives his personal supervision, and the more it increases the more he has to supervise both the subordinates and the employees. I merely wanted to impress upon my colleague that fact, because I know he is in earnest.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, in this Bureau of Plant Industry there are 500 projects, and the work of this department increases every year just to the proportion of the increase of population. They asked for an increase of \$400,000 in this very bureau, and we carefully went over it and cut this item down to \$200,000, and that is about the increase to this bureau. I think that the gentleman, who knows so much about ancient history and the cure of hams—and, by the way, if he comes down in Virginia we will show him exactly how to cure a Smithfield ham—might trust Dr. Galloway and the people in this bureau to a greater extent than he seems to do. I hope he will not make these captious objections. In any point of order upon any large matter here we will consider it patiently and hear him patiently; but if he will excuse me, it looks to me like this is frivolous to make these captious objections, as he has been making them. I hope he will excuse me for being earnest in this matter.

I do not waste time here. We want to get this bill through in the proper time.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me just a moment?

Mr. FOWLER. I am willing to allow the following salaries to pass with the points of order I have mentioned pending, namely, the salary of the chief of bureau, the chief clerk, the officer in charge of publications, and the officer in charge of records. If any of these gentlemen are not satisfied that there are increases in these salaries—

Mr. LAMB. You make a point of order?

Mr. FOWLER. I say I desire to pass it and let the point of order be pending until to-morrow morning, in order to give you an opportunity to make the examination.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that I have not been able, so far as I have examined into the statutes, to find that there is any law anywhere fixing the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, and if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] has that, and the salary has been fixed by law, then of course it is necessarily subject to a point of order, and the gentleman might as well make it. We will concede it, and will go on attending to business here.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Will my colleague yield, inasmuch as he has reserved a point of order in this connection?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I do not quite agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee that even this objection would be a captious objection if my colleague would make it, nor do I think he is given to making trivial and captious objections. I think it is a question that should be discussed and resolved on its merits. What I want to address to the attention of my colleague is a statement made a few moments ago that the heads of the subordinates here are increased; that the actual clerical force is increased; and he knows that the demands of our correspondence from our constituents, which goes

into this department, is increased on all lines. Our country is growing. When we send these requests down we want them attended to accurately and properly, and with immediate dispatch. It is very important to have at the head of a department of this character men of capacity and qualifications for that purpose, and if we do have them, I want to suggest to my colleague that this increase, if an increase it is, is a very moderate one, and if you take the aggregate of the compensation, it is entirely reasonable for men of that capacity and ability.

Mr. LAMB. Let me answer right there, in reply to the suggestion made, that the increase in this Bureau of Plant Industry, is only \$1,600.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor. I hope the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] did not understand me to raise a criticism that my friend from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] was making captious suggestions. I made no such statement, nor have I intended to do it. The gentleman, of course, has a perfect right to make these objections. But I want to say that this Bureau of Plant Industry is the only bureau that devotes its entire attention to the agriculture of the country. It is conducting scientific research work relative to crop growing; it is conducting farm demonstration work in the South and farm demonstration work in the North. It is doing the greatest work, in my judgment, of any bureau in the Department of Agriculture or of any bureau in the Government service. There is not a more competent man anywhere, there is not a man who gives closer attention to the service, there is not a man who is more efficient in the service, than Dr. Galloway, the man at the head of this bureau. And I do hope my friend from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] will not make a point of order against these men. Dr. Galloway has been drawing this salary of \$5,000 for a number of years. Of these few men whose salaries we have increased one or two hundred dollars a year one has not had an increase of salary for seven years and one has not had an increase for four or five years, and we can not keep our best men in these lines of technical and scientific work unless we are willing to give them a reasonable salary. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the man who acted as temporary Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Dr. Powell, a few years ago left the department and went to California and entered another work at a salary of \$12,000 a year. A lot of these men at the head of these bureaus are really working at a sacrifice to themselves and their families. I hope my friend will not press this point.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, just a moment, please.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] asks unanimous consent—

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. The regular order is a decision on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not know that the unanimous-consent request had been made at all. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] make his point of order?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph may be passed with the points of order pending against the three salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's colleague [Mr. MANN] has just asked for the regular order, which is equivalent to an objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the regular order is the deciding of the point of order. Is that right?

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] either to make the point of order or withdraw it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I submit once more for unanimous consent that the paragraph may be passed with the points of order pending against the four salaries mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] asks that his request for unanimous consent be again presented.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to say that we have been all day upon this bill and are now upon page 13. There are 64 pages to this bill, and unless we settle something as we go on there is no possibility of passing the appropriation bills at this session except under suspension of the rules, if it can be done in that way. Therefore I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objects. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] make the point of order?

Mr. FOWLER. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman before him the statute limiting the salary to \$3,500?

Mr. FOWLER. I have not the statute before me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman certain that that is the statute at the present time?

Mr. FOWLER. I have made a thorough examination of the statutes and I am of the opinion, from the information I can get, that the salary was originally fixed at \$2,000, and then carried by increases in appropriation bills. That was the reason, Mr. Chairman, why I was willing to let it pass, so that there might be a certainty. I do not desire to press the point of order unless the statute justifies it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is through, I desire to submit to the Chair that I have read a digest of the laws applicable to the Department of Agriculture, prepared by the solicitor of the department some years ago, and I have failed to find where the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry is fixed by any statute whatever. The Bureau of Plant Industry differs from the Weather Bureau or from the Bureau of Animal Industry, in that the Bureau of Plant Industry has been created upon an appropriation bill and not by any statute setting out its limitations or fixing the salary.

Mr. FOWLER. I have indicated to the Chair my best information concerning the matter, that the statute first enacted upon this subject, fixing the salary, was in 1862, as I recollect, and that subsequently there have been some amendments made thereto; but the salary as to this first office was fixed at \$2,000. That is my best information.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] will state that he knows as a matter of fact that the salary of this chief of bureau is fixed by law at a sum different from that which is carried in this bill, the Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I can not do that, Mr. Chairman, because I desire to be fair.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair overrules the point of order, on the assumption that the amount carried in the appropriation bill is authorized by law.

Mr. FOWLER. That is, for the chief of the bureau?

The CHAIRMAN. For the chief of the bureau.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, the chief clerk will be in the same condition, Mr. Chairman, as the chief of the bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman any definite information on that?

Mr. FOWLER. Only, as I say, I have read the statute upon this question fixing the salary, and my recollection is that when it first came in it was fixed at \$2,000, although I do not desire at all to say to the Chair that I am positive about the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of a positive statement from some Member that the salary provided in this bill is different from the salary provided by law, the Chair will overrule the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, nearly all of these divisions in the Agricultural Department were provided, as they now are, in the agricultural appropriation bill a few years ago, since I have been a Member of the House. The only fixing of salaries, as I recall it, was by making the appropriation. I do not think there is any law outside of the appropriation bill except the organic law of the department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. There is an organic law of 1862, fixing the salaries of a number of officers and public places in this department.

The other item to which I make the point of order is the salary of the officer in charge of publications, \$2,200, an increase of \$200.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains that point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. One officer in charge of records, in line 7, page 13, increased from \$2,000 to \$2,100.

The CHAIRMAN. An increase of \$100 above the last appropriation bill?

Mr. FOWLER. The Chair sustains the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. As the bill now stands, do the words in lines 5 and 6, "one officer in charge of publications," remain in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The salary is stricken out.

Mr. MANN. There is a blank there now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Well, I would leave it blank.

Mr. LAMB. I will ask the Clerk to insert the old amount, \$2,000, in line 6, page 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to the fact that the Clerk can not do

that. It requires an amendment by the committee to make that change.

Mr. LAMB. Then I offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 6, at the beginning of the line, insert "\$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAMB. And in line 7, page 13, I move to insert "\$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 7, insert "\$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of plant diseases and pathological collections, \$25,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 15, line 12, after the word "diseases," by inserting "including diseases of ginseng," and in line 13, strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$30,000," so that the paragraph will read:

"For investigations of plant diseases, including ginseng, and pathological collections, \$30,000."

Mr. LEVER. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment at the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Morse], who was not able to remain here. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Morse] is very much interested in this subject. He has investigated it carefully and is of the opinion that the money is necessary. Diseases of the ginseng have developed, and the growers of it have not been able to deal with them. They feel that they need help, and they ask for this modest, moderate appropriation of \$5,000.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. This paragraph is for investigations of plant diseases?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Is ginseng a plant?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. No doubt it is.

Mr. CANNON. Then what is the use of the amendment?

Mr. MANN. It carries an appropriation of an additional \$5,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is an additional appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. I did not hear that part of it.

Mr. LEVER. Will my colleague permit a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I wonder if my colleague knows that the Department of Agriculture on April 30, 1912, issued a bulletin of 44 pages on the Diseases of the Ginseng and Their Control, which pamphlet I hold in my hand?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I did not know about that.

Mr. LAMB. I have a letter from the Secretary touching that very matter, saying substantially that they are doing this work now.

Mr. MANN. I have read the bulletin issued by the Agricultural Department on ginseng and another one formerly issued by the department. The gentleman from Wisconsin, on whose behalf the amendment is offered, raises ginseng and is very familiar with the trade in this country. Ginseng is a plant that grows here and is exported to China as a sort of medicine. The plant is subject to diseases. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows the subject thoroughly and has given a great deal of attention to it. This plant is attacked by diseases which ought to be investigated by the department. The gentleman from Wisconsin has been a Member of this House for a long time. During the last session of Congress he worked day and night for months in connection with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Sims], going over the reports and the findings of the Court of Claims on these war-claims propositions, and on his statement and the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee the House passed the war-claims bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin after doing all this work is now about to retire from Congress. He knows the subject of ginseng, and I think we can afford to take his judgment for \$5,000 on this proposition when this side of the House has taken it on a million dollars of war claims.

Mr. SIMS. Over a million and a half dollars. And while I am on my feet I want to ask if there is any more profitable thing grown in this country, if it can be protected against disease, than ginseng? It is worth \$6 a pound, and when I used to dig it as a boy I sold it for 30 and 40 cents a pound.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will pardon me, there is now available for the study of plants \$25,000, and it is moved to increase the amount by \$5,000.

Mr. MANN. The purpose of the amendment is to give the department an opportunity, if it will, to use all or a part of the \$5,000 by increasing the amount for the investigation of ginseng. The department is not now engaged in the study of the subject of ginseng by actual experiment.

Mr. CANNON. I will ask my colleague could any or all of this \$5,000, under the law, be used for the employment of any person?

Mr. MANN. I suppose that is what it will be used for; that is the way they will study it; they will have somebody go out where they are raising it and study these diseases.

Mr. CANNON. And this \$5,000, neither in whole nor in part, is contemplated for the employment of our colleague?

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all. I am glad my colleague asked that question; but there will be no large salaries paid out of it. The gentleman from Wisconsin is not looking for and is not to have the job.

Mr. CANNON. I am very glad the gentleman said that, because of the very valuable services rendered by the gentleman in connection with the gentleman from Tennessee an evil-minded person might gather that this was to be given to him.

Mr. MANN. I suppose some one might have inferred it from my remarks, but that is not the case.

Mr. LAMB. I think the Government has given some attention to this, but with the great reverence I have for the minority I am willing to yield to the request.

Mr. SIMS. I want to say that there was an experiment made in raising ginseng right close to my own home. The gentleman cleared the land, put in the ginseng, and it did well for two or three years, and then through some insect or some disease it was entirely destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the physiology of crop plants and for testing and breeding varieties thereof, \$30,380.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that this appropriation is the same as it was last year, and yet the department in its estimate asked for \$6,200 additional, and gave as a reason that they wanted to enlarge the scope of investigations of dates and figs and work on cotton with the Indians. I made some remarks this morning in regard to the Egyptian cotton industry and that language caught my eye. If anything can be done to assist the Indians in the cultivation of a high grade of long-staple cotton, I think the additional money would be well expended. Figs and dates can be grown in Arizona and California, and I am of the opinion that the cultivation of such fruits ought to be encouraged.

Mr. LAMB. The gentleman seems to know what the chief of the bureau said and that is all I know about it.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the committee declined to give the increase. It seems to me that this work has great merit.

Mr. LAMB. We had to trim down some of these estimates; we could not give everything they asked.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acclimatization and adaptation investigations of cotton, corn, and other crops introduced from tropical regions, and for the improvement of cotton by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, \$33,300.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the same reason that I did before. In the estimates the department has asked for \$10,000 additional, giving as a reason that they desire to properly carry out important work which has been inaugurated in the improvement of cotton and the development of community work in cotton growing, and that this is of vital importance to the cotton interests of the South.

Mr. LAMB. We think that we have given them enough.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee allowed the same amount as last year.

Mr. LAMB. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For studying and testing commercial seeds, including the testing of samples of seeds of grasses, clover, or alfalfa secured in the open market, and where such samples are found to be adulterated or misbranded the results of the tests shall be published, together with the names of the persons by whom the seeds were offered for sale, \$26,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 18, at the beginning of the line, insert the words "and lawn-grass seed."

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman object to adding to his amendment "and Bermuda"?

Mr. MANN. Bermuda is already covered by the bill.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Does not "seeds of grasses" cover lawn seed also?

Mr. MANN. Lawn seed is the proper term, although I have made it lawn-grass seed. It is usually a mixture of seed. A lot of seed houses have gotten into the habit of mixing seed containing mainly the seed of weeds. I want them to feel that if they continue that they are in danger of having their names published. I want the practice stopped.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal production, and the study of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, \$104,925.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, after line 26, add the following:

"Provided, That not less than \$30,000 shall be set aside for the study of corn improvement and methods of corn production."

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this amendment is agreeable to the committee. If so, I will not take up the time of the House in discussing it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, speaking for the committee, I will say that the amendment is agreeable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, and for farm demonstration work, \$375,000: *Provided*, That of the amount hereby appropriated the sum of \$8,800 may be used in the investigation and utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants as food for stock.

[Mr. LEVER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations in connection with western irrigation agriculture, the utilization of lands reclaimed under the reclamation act, and other areas in the arid and semiarid regions, \$73,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice in this case that the committee did not allow the amount asked for by the department, and in reading the justification in the Book of Estimates it says that they need this extra money, some \$3,600, on account of the extension of important work on cotton production in the Southwest, especially Egyptian cotton. The committee did not feel they could possibly allow what the department wanted for this particular work?

Mr. LAMB. We thought they could get on with what they had.

Mr. HAYDEN. And allowed the amount they had last year?

Mr. LAMB. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the methods of fruit growing, harvesting, packing, storing, handling, and shipping, and for experimental shipments of fruits within the United States and to foreign countries, \$92,000.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, at the end of line 17, on page 18, after "\$92,000," by adding the following: "*Provided*, That \$5,000 of the amount hereby appropriated may be set aside and used in the investigation and improvement of the pecan industry."

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am in hopes that the committee will agree to this amendment. The Government has done very little toward the encouragement of the pecan industry in this country. In my section it is an industry that is growing very rapidly. It was not until recently, if at all, that the Government issued a bulletin with respect to the pecan industry.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; many years ago.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I have been unable to find it on the list. I have had several calls for it, and you can not get it. I know that recently there was in the course of

preparation a bulletin on the pecan industry, but I do not think it has as yet been issued.

Mr. MANN. They issued a very handsome book on the pecan industry.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. It has not been my good fortune to see that.

Mr. MANN. I expect it is out of print.

Mr. LAMB. Why did not the gentleman ask the department about this?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I called up the department; Mr. Galloway was not there, and I talked with Mr. Jones, his assistant. He said some work had been done along this line, but he did not think very much. I am not asking by this amendment any additional amount of money. I am asking that only a small part of this total appropriation be used for this purpose—\$5,000. I have had several letters with reference to this, and the people in our section are very much interested in it.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. If the Chairman will permit—I do not know but what it might throw light on the subject—the Government is engaged, and has been, I know personally, for over three years, in sending out agents for the investigation of the diseases of the pecan; I do not know what appropriation it comes under, but looking to the proper treatment of the disease of blight and worm in the pecan, and so forth.

For more than three years they have been doing that, and have been inspecting orchards all through the pecan belt to ascertain what fruit turned out the best, which was bearing the best, and so forth. This has come under my personal observation, and the bulletin the gentleman [Mr. HARRISON] refers to, when it is published, I know from personal observation, with the information they are acquiring it will not be conjecture, but it will be a statement of actual facts.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Has that bulletin been published yet?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. It has not, but I think it is in press, or in course of preparation.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the Government, in my opinion, has not gone into this subject as much as the growth of the industry demands, and I think they should be allowed to go into it more fully. Now, as to whether there is sufficient appropriation or whether it comes out of this item I can not say.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield? Is the gentleman aware this item is expended in the matter of shipping fruit?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I called up the department and asked under which of these paragraphs would this item come, and they told me this would be the paragraph under which the pecan industry would come.

Mr. MANN. I think it has in the past mainly been used in connection with the packing and shipping of citrus fruits and apples not only in this country but abroad. I do not think it would have anything to do, in the main, with growing pecans.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Under this amendment there would be no question about it, because it says that \$5,000 of the amount may be used for the purpose of investigating and improving the pecan industry.

Mr. CANDLER. This amendment only provides that the department may have discretion in this matter, and this industry is growing in importance. I have recently had inquiries in reference to it from our section of the country myself, and other sections of the United States. This is a matter the department can well investigate, and they can use this amount if they see fit to do so, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$296,000, of which amount not less than \$257,000 shall be allotted for congressional distribution. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting,

assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon such envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided, also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided, also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants: *Provided further*, That \$30,000 of which sum, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used for the purchase and distribution of drought-resistant field seeds through the Great Plains area and other dry-land sections of the United States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph beginning on line 22, page 19, down to and including line 17, on page 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph beginning on line 22, page 19, down to and including line 17, on page 22.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. COX. Wait a minute, Mr. Chairman. I will say to the chairman now that we will not conclude this paragraph this evening, because I am not going to let a vote go on this unless a quorum is present.

Mr. LAMB. Before the gentleman does that, I ask permission to turn to page 21, line 10, and strike out the word "such" and insert the word "each."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 10, strike out the word "such" and insert in lieu thereof the word "each."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BEALL of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 28283, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 27987. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. R. 27944. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. R. 27988. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. R. 27986. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. R. 27879. An act providing authority for the Northern Pacific Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River in section 36, township 134 north, range 79 west, in the State of North Dakota.;

H. R. 25002. An act to amend section 73 and section 76 of the act of August 27, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes";

H. R. 21524. An act for the relief of Frederick H. Ferris; and

H. R. 1332. An act regulating Indian allotments disposed of by will.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 109. An act to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect.

CLAIMS.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19115, an act making appropriations for payment of certain claims in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19115, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. SIMS, Mr. LEE of Georgia, and Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin.

SLAVERY IN PERU (H. DOC. 1366).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit a report of the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in response to the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on August 1, 1912, calling upon the Secretary of State, "if not incompatible with the public interest," for "all information in the possession of his department concerning the alleged existence of slavery in Peru, and especially all information tending to show the truth or falsity of the following statement made in an editorial in the London Times of July 15, 1912: 'The bluebook shows that in an immense territory which Peru professes to govern the worst evils of the plantation slavery which our forefathers labored to suppress are at this moment equalled or surpassed. They are so horrible that they might seem incredible were their existence supported by less trustworthy evidence.'"

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 7, 1913.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10.30 a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10.30 a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman expect to go ahead at 10.30 a. m., or does the Committee on Rules intend to report a rule at 10.30 a. m., if the House meets at that time?

Mr. LAMB. We were planning to go on. I did not know anything about the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MANN. I think everyone in the House understands that the House is going to do other business. I do not care how they work it, if they work it at all. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] might know, I thought.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the House meeting at 10.30 a. m.

Mr. MANN. There is no objection on the gentleman's part. But does the gentleman know, if the House meets at 10.30 a. m., that we will go ahead with the Agriculture appropriation bill or that the Committee on Rules will report at that time?

Mr. GARRETT. The Committee on Rules has adopted a rule which it proposes to ask consideration for to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Are they likely to come in at 10.30 a. m.?

Mr. GARRETT. They are likely to come in at the first opportunity they have to present a privileged resolution.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION IN ALASKA (H. DOC. NO. 1346).

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on the Territories to ask unanimous consent to offer the following resolution and ask its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] asks unanimous consent to offer a resolution and have it immediately considered. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 820.

Resolved, That the message of the President, transmitting the report of the commission appointed to conduct an examination into the transportation question in the Territory of Alaska, together with the report of the commission, and accompanying papers and illustrations, be printed as a document.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that it should be printed as a House document.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes. I move that that amendment be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amended resolution.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with the order previously adopted, adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 8, 1913, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Mille Lacs Lake and Onamia Lake, Minn. (H. Doc. No. 1364); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Red River near Fulton, Ark. (H. Doc. No. 1363); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Bennett River, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 1362); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Postmaster General submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the Post Office Department on account of the parcel post act, etc. (H. Doc. No. 1360); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting estimate of appropriation for improvement, extension, and survey of certain roads in Mount Rainier National Park, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 1361); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting estimates of appropriations required by the several departments of the Government to complete the service for the current fiscal year and for prior years (H. Doc. No. 1365); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WEBB, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17593) to divest intoxicating liquors of their interstate-commerce character in certain cases, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1461), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 28409) to empower the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota to establish the status of the allottees on the White Earth Indian Reservation in said State, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1459), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 6781) in reference to the issuance of patents and copies of surveys of private land claims, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1473), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 7875) to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in the Chuckawalla Valley and Palo Verde Mesa, Riverside County, Cal., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1474), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HIGGINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 8058) providing for an increase of salary of the United States attorney for the district of Connecticut, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1462), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SWEET, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 24296) for the relief of Alonzo D. Cadwallader, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1476), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18217) for the relief of Sylvester W. Barnes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1477), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANTHONY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6793) for the relief of Charles A. Bess, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1466), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18727) for the relief of Lewis Wood, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1464), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8921) to correct the military record of William H. Seward, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1465), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FARR, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4309) for the relief of Dommick Taheny and John W. Mortimer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1467), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12173) to donate to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for park purposes the tract of land known as the "powder-house lot," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1463), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 28261) for the relief of G. O. Nolan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1470), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19906) for the relief of Cornell Riveland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1469), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 8139) for the relief of William W. Prude, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1475), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 26915) to reimburse the postmaster at Seaside, Oreg., for the loss by fire of postal savings cards and stamps, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1471), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 27979) for the relief of Ed. P. Ambrose, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No.

1472), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FARR, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1911) for the relief of James R. Brown, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1468), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 28672) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, accompanied by a report (No. 1460), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 28669) to authorize the payment to the State of Oklahoma of an amount of money equal to 5 per cent of the proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within what was formerly Oklahoma Territory, on sales made between April 22, 1889, and November 16, 1907, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28670) to pay the State of Oklahoma \$20,000,000 in lieu of taxes on lands and other property within the State sold and disposed of by the United States under terms and conditions prohibiting the State from taxing the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 28671) for a specially designed postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the treaty of Ghent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAY: A bill (H. R. 28672) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 28673) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River in Beltrami County, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 28674) for the control and regulation of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls of Niagara, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 28675) to enable the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Indian Affairs to investigate and secure information directly from the Indians of any tribe or band as to the status of their affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 28676) to amend section 914 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28677) to amend section 4197 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28678) to amend the laws relating to shippers' manifests of merchandise for exportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 28679) to establish a national aeronautical laboratory; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 28680) granting two condemned cannon to the municipality of Goshen, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 28681) to authorize the Secretary of War to donate two condemned brass or bronze cannons and cannon balls to the city of Pembroke, Bryan County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 28696) to authorize use of additional sum in the erection of a public building on the site now owned by the Government in Big Rapids, in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: Resolution (H. Res. 818) providing for the consideration of H. R. 17593; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LOBECK: Resolution (H. Res. 819) authorizing the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives to make an investigation into the affairs of the Washington Gas Light Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 394) requesting the President to communicate with Great Britain with a view to the appointment of a commission

to investigate the feasibility of a plan to rectify the boundary of southeastern Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Memorial from the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, urging the necessity of a system of levees or flood walls along the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial from the Legislature of New Mexico, protesting against settling the Fort Sill Indians on the Mescalero-Apache Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: Memorial from the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, urging appropriations to provide for the construction of a system of levees along the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. POST: Memorial from the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, urging appropriations to provide for the construction of a system of levees along the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, favoring amendment of the national banking laws, authorizing national banks to loan money upon farm-land mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALLEN: Memorial adopted by the Ohio Legislature, urging Congress to make an appropriation for survey and examination into the feasibility of constructing levees or flood walls for the protection of cities and villages along the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Memorial from the Legislature of South Dakota, requesting Congress to make Fort Meade, S. Dak., a brigade post, with permanent brick or stone barracks, officers' quarters, and other buildings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to limit the jurisdiction of the district court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota, praying Congress to enact a presidential preferential primary act; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, memorial adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota requesting the Congress of the United States to pass the Newlands bill relating to river regulation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Memorial adopted by the General Assembly of Ohio, urging upon Congress to make an appropriation for survey and examination into the feasibility of constructing levees or flood walls for the protection of cities and villages along the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 28682) granting an increase of pension to Walter L. Messer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 28683) for the relief of the heirs of Simeon Burke, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 28684) for the relief of Maurice Edgar Rose; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28685) granting an increase of pension to Anne Darcy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 28686) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 28687) for the relief of the trustees of Pea Vine Academy, Walker County, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28688) for the relief of the trustees of Pea Vine Church, Walker County, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 28689) granting an increase of pension to Charles Britton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 28690) granting a pension to Della Peterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 28691) for the relief of Martha Cutts Almy and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 28692) granting an increase of pension to George H. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 28693) for the relief of the estate of George D. Pool, sr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 28694) for the relief of Gerhard Heyboer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 28695) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus Balcom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 28697) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Domingos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 28698) granting a pension to Thomas Keeler; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the Ohio State Board of Agriculture, favoring the passage of legislation to appropriate funds for the relief of hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Leona Griffith, teacher, and 23 pupils, Granville, Ohio, favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. E. Jacob and 23 citizens of Pataskala, Licking County, Ohio, favoring the passage of Kenyon-McCumber bill to withdraw from interstate-commerce protection liquors imported into dry territory for illegal use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Petition of growers of ginseng of the State of Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation making appropriations for further investigations of the diseases peculiar to ginseng; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Williams & Stevenson, New York, N. Y., and Ernest Thompson Seton, Greenwich, Conn., favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. H. Limbie, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Page bill for granting Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. C. Williams, deputy collector of the United States customs service, port of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 25635, providing for the labeling and tagging of all fabrics and articles of clothing intended for sale under interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the Osage National Council, Pawhuska, Okla., favoring the passage of Senate bill 5675, relative to revising, amending, etc., the penal laws of the United States referring to all cases of bribery of representatives of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petition of Members of Montcalm Grange and pupils of the schools of Enfield Center, N. H., favoring the passage of the McLean bill for Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DODDS: Petition of citizens of Big Rapids, Mich., favoring the passage of the Kenyon "red light" injunction bill for the cleaning up of Washington for the inauguration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the American Wood Preservers' Association, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of legislation for the removal of creosote oils from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the American Wood Preservers' Association, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of legislation for the removal of creosote oil from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Wood Preservers' Association, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of legislation for placing a duty on creosote oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Forestry Association, Washington, D. C., protesting against the passage of House bill 23293, for the protection of the water supply of the city of Colorado Springs and the town of Manitou, Colo., as amended and passed in the Senate; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Farmers' National Congress, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3, for Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 7208, proposing radical changes in law relating to the carriage of cargo by sea; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.; James B. Munroe, Boston, Mass.; F. L. Kennedy, Cambridge, Mass.; and W. H. Gimble, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3, for Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of the Scandinavian Temperance Union, of Fergus Falls, Minn., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill for preventing the shipment of liquor into dry territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Mary E. Anderson and Maude P. Boynton, San Jose, Cal., favoring the passage of the Kenyon "red-light" injunction bill for the cleaning up of Washington during the inauguration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Palo Alto Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the passage of House bill 26167; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National League of Government Employees, Washington, D. C., and the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., both favoring the passage of the workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association, Portland, Oreg., and Frederick J. Koster, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation making further appropriation for the control of forest fires at the heads of navigable streams; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Thomas Mercantile Co., Gilroy, Cal.; the L. M. Davenport Co., Los Angeles, Cal.; and the Rudgear-Merle Co., San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 27367, for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for the recognition of the Chinese Republic by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of T. B. Anderson, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 1309, for the establishment of a council of national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the California Club, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation making appropriation for the suppression of the white-slave traffic; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Cooper Ornithological Club, Hollywood, Cal.; Ernest Thompson Seton, Greenwich, Conn.; and the California State Audubon Society, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of the McLean bill, granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of the Ogden Trades and Labor Assembly, Ogden, Utah, asking the repeal of the Dick military law, which requires that the militia shall consist of all able-bodied male citizens of the respective States, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of the Forest Park Reservation Commission of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J., favoring the passage of legislation making further appropriations for protecting the forests at the head of navigable streams from fire; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of sundry citizens of Appleton, Wis., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-McCumber bill, to withdraw from interstate-commerce protection liquors imported into dry territory for illegal use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of District Council No. 24, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, Portland, Oreg., protesting against the Dick military law, requiring all able-bodied male citizens to belong to the militia, and asking the repeal of same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Astoria Chamber of Commerce, Astoria, Oreg., favoring the passage of legislation ceding title to Sand Island to the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the American Wood Preservers' Association, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of legislation removing creosote oil from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Branch, Navy Young Men's Christian Association, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Webb bill, preventing the shipment of liquor into dry territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCOY: Petition of citizens of East Orange and Newark; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Irvington; Union Street Church and the Newark Social Union, Newark;

citizens and members of the Methodist Church, Irvington, N. J., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-McCumber bill, preventing the shipment of liquor into dry territory; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the American Wood Preservers' Association, protesting against the passage of legislation for removing creosote oil from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petition for the relief of Martha Cutts Almez and to pay for overtime work in the navy yards at Portsmouth, N. H., Boston, Mass., and Mare Island, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 27016, equipping all locomotives with electric headlights; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Oakland, Cal., favoring passage of legislation, making Oakland, Cal., the terminal for the proposed national highway; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the American Wood Preservers' Association, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of legislation removing creosote oil from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Kirk, Geary & Co., Sacramento, Cal., protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the tariff on chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Prof. Charles A. Kafoid, University of California, Berkeley, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation repealing the law prohibiting the killing of male fur seals; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the California Associated Societies for the Conservation of Wild Life, favoring the passage of the Weeks-McLean bill for the Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of the Connecticut Public Library Committee, Hartford, Conn., favoring an amendment to the present parcel-post system giving books sent to or from a public library parcel-post rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the present banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the California Club, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation making appropriations for the suppression of the white-slave traffic; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Italian Chamber of Commerce, New York, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3175, for the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the American Wood Preservers' Association, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of legislation for the removal of creosote oil from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the American Wood Preservers' Association, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of legislation for the removal of creosote oil from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Forest Park Reservation Commission of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J., favoring the passage of legislation making further appropriations for the protection of the forests at the head of navigable streams from fires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the American Forestry Association, Washington, D. C., protesting against the passage of House bill 23293, for the protection of the water supply of the city of Colorado Springs and the town of Manitou, Colo., as amended by the Senate; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Summit, Ridgewood, Plainfield, Boonton, Mendham, Morristown, Morris County, N. J.; the Morristown Prohibition Alliance, Morristown, N. J.; the St. James Methodist Episcopal Church, Elizabeth, N. J.; Irvington Methodist Episcopal Church, Irvington, N. J.; and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Mendham, N. J., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-McCumber bill to withdraw from interstate-commerce protection liquors imported into dry territory for illegal use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Succasunna and Ledgewood, N. J., favoring the passage of the Kenyon "red-light" injunction bill, for the cleaning up of

Washington, D. C., for the inauguration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and sundry citizens of Washington, N. J., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill for preventing the shipment of liquor into dry territory and the Prouty red-light bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Ohio State Board of Agriculture, favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the extermination of hog cholera; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Bode, Iowa, protesting against the passage of any legislation changing the present tariff on sugar so that it will injuriously affect the sugar-beet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 8, 1913.

The Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, as we stand before Thee on this day of precious memory we thank Thee that life is not so short that we can not for a time lay aside our customary labors and yield ourselves to the tender and holy influences of this hour. As here we stand in Thy presence, we would take the shoes from off our feet, knowing that where Thy servants have faithfully and truly sought to do Thy will there indeed is holy ground. Here manifest Thyself unto our waiting spirits, we pray Thee, and fulfill unto us Thy promise that where Thy children are gathered together in Thy name there Thou wilt be in their midst.

O Thou who art God, not of the dead but of the living, seeing that all souls live unto Thee, we thank Thee, not as we would but as we are able, for the blessed privilege of having known and labored with him whom we this day commemorate. Inspire our hearts, quicken our memories, and direct our thoughts, that the life which we would now honor may stand before us with all its power and in all its beauty. That life was Thine, our Father, and Thine it is. We yield Thee all praise, O Holy One, for the priceless heritage of the memory of him whose life is now hid with Christ in Thee.

We pray Thee to be near to those to whom this life was most dear and to comfort those whose tender sorrow is too great for words and too deep for tears. Uphold them with Thy heavenly power and let Thy grace be sufficient for them until we, too, stand in Thy nearer presence, where we shall know even as we have been known.

And unto Thee, our God, who hast loved us with an everlasting love and hast called us into Thine eternal kingdom in Christ, unto Thee who hast given us eternal comfort and good hope through the Gospel, be all glory and praise on earth and in heaven, now and forevermore. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CANCELLATION OF HOMESTEAD ENTRIES (S. DOC. NO. 1064).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. BACON) laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 27th ultimo, certain information relative to whether or not the department contemplates the cancellation of certain homestead entries upon any of the United States reclamation projects in the State of Idaho because of the failure of entrymen to make payment covering the operation and maintenance charges, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of useless papers, books, etc., on the files of the department no longer needed in the transaction of the public business and having no permanent or historical value. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints, as the committee on the part of the Senate, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of Iowa, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to pass the Kenyon-Sheppard bill relating to the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors.

Whereas for a number of years last past the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage has been prohibited by law in a large number of the cities and counties of the State of Iowa; and

Whereas under the protection of the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution a large quantity of liquor is shipped from without the State to points within the State and disposed of in violation of law; and

Whereas these interstate shipments of liquor and the illegal disposition of the same result in drunkenness, prosecutions, expensive litigation, the commission of crime, and the pauperizing of individuals and families: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized to pass the Kenyon-Sheppard bill now pending before Congress, looking to the correction of these evils, and that the Representatives in Congress and the United States Senators from Iowa be, and they are hereby, requested to use all honorable means to secure the passage of said act; and

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the house to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Representatives in Congress from Iowa, and to the President of the United States.

January 25, 1913, introduced in the house by Bliss, of Ringgold.

January 27, 1913, adopted by the house.

January 28, 1913, received by the senate.

January 30, 1913, adopted by the senate.

A. C. GUSTAFSON,

Chief Clerk of the House.

JOS. E. MEYER,

Secretary of the Senate.

EDWARD H. CUNNINGHAM,

Speaker of the House.

W. T. HARDING,

President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that this concurrent resolution originated in the house of the representatives of the thirty-fifth general assembly.

A. C. GUSTAFSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of North Dakota, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

House concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the measure now pending in the Senate known as the Kenyon-Sheppard bill.

Whereas there is now on the statutes of the State a law forbidding the sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors in the State of North Dakota; and

Whereas the interstate common carriers are bringing into our State large quantities of intoxicating liquors to be sold in open violation of our State laws and to the great injury of the people of the State; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a measure known as the Kenyon-Sheppard bill, which has for its purpose the prevention of interstate shipments of liquors into States where the laws of the State forbid the sale of same: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby, earnestly memorialized and requested to pass the Kenyon-Sheppard bill at the earliest date possible and without amendment; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, properly certified, be forwarded at once to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry ministers of Keene, N. H., and of the congregation of the St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Manchester, N. H., praying for the passage of the so-called Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Broken Bow, Nebr., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Fremont, Nebr., remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called Aldrich currency plan, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of 400 citizens of Laurel, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STONE presented petitions of the Citizens Protective League, of Niagara; of sundry citizens of Chesapeake; of the faculty of the Central Wesleyan College, of Warrenton; of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Jasper; of the Minnie Steele Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Perry County; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kahoka; of citizens and voters of Laclede County; of the Southern Metho-